COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN - KANSAS

Volume IX WINTER 1957 Number 1

Hero and Leander in Scottish Balladry. By Gillian Rodger 1

The Postwar Polish Historical Novel. By Xenia Gasiorowska 17

Thomas Wolfe and Anatole France: A Study of Some Unpublished Experiments. By Daniel L. Delakas 33

Sidney's Idea of the "Right Poet." By A. C. Hamilton 51

Conrad's *Under Western Eyes* and Mann's *Doctor Faustus*. By Julian B. Kaye 60

Book Reviews 66

The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance, by Hans Baron; *Humanistic and Political Literature in Florence and Venice at the Beginning of the Quattrocento*, by Hans Baron (Giuseppe Toffanin). *Goethe-Bibliographie*, by Hans Pyritz (Wolfgang Leppmann). *Diderot en Allemagne*, by Roland Mortier (Liselotte Dieckmann). *Machiavelli Anticristo*, by Giuseppe Prezzolini; *Vita de Niccolò Machiavelli*, by Roberto Ridolfi (J. H. Whitfield). *La Grande-Bretagne dans le roman français: 1914-1940*, by Marius-François Guyard (Maurice A. Lecuyer). *Une Irlandaise libérale en France sous la Restauration, Lady Morgan*, by Marcel Ian Moraud (Robert L. Myers). *Jean-Pierre de Crousaz*, by Jacqueline E. de La Harpe (Leland Thielemann). *Studien zur Auffassung des Nordischen in der Goethezeit*, by Horst Oppel (Richard Samuel). *The Great Rimbaud Forgery*, by Bruce Morrissette (B. F. Bart). *German Proverbs*, by Edmund P. Kremer (Francis W. Bradley). *Icon and Idea*, by Herbert Read (Bernard Gicovate). *Istoriya Ukrayinskoyi Literatury vid Pochatkiv do Doby Realizmu*, by Dmytro Čiževsky (Clarence A. Manning).

Varia 95

Books Received. Announcements.

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation of the Comparative Literature Section of the Modern Language Association of America

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1949, at the post office at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.

Comparative Literature

Editor
CHANDLER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor
WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Editorial Board

FRANCIS FERGUSSON
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, N. J.

VICTOR LANGE
Cornell University
Ithaca, N.Y.

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D.C.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, movements, genres, periods, and authors —from the earliest times to the present. They particularly welcome longer studies on comparative topics and on problems of criticism.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to: Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The subscription rate is $3.50 a year. The price of single copies is $1.00. Complete back sets are available for sale or exchange. Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence concerning exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.

Indexed in International Index to Periodicals.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
https://abbassa.wordpress.com

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME IX WINTER 1957 NUMBER 1

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN - KANSAS

HERO AND LEANDER IN SCOTTISH BALLADRY

GILLIAN RODGER

THE ubiquity of the great traditional ballads increasingly engrosses the specialist and fascinates the layman.[1] Those founded on the universal themes of life and death, love and hate, seem in particular to possess the unique power of taking geographic and linguistic barriers in their stride and of appearing in recognizable form in regions as far separated as Scandinavia and America, Russia and Scotland. The Danish *vise Elveskud*,[2] for instance, with its tale of a bridegroom's enchantment and death, is one strand in a vast ballad network which links Denmark with Sweden, Norway, the Faroes, Iceland, Scotland, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, and Bohemia.[3] Scarcely less widespread is the ballad of the poisoned lover, *Lord Rendal*, which has thrilled generations of Englishmen, and has its counterparts in Germany and Italy.[4]

Another theme which occurs in the ballad literature of many European lands is that founded on the situation of two lovers, separated by a stretch of water; the youth dares to cross it and is drowned. It is notoriously difficult to produce conclusive evidence regarding any aspect of the traditional ballad—the problems of origin and derivation, for instance, being well-nigh insoluble. That the ballads founded on this drowning theme may well have a purely local origin is stressed by Julius Sahr, who writes:

Viel zu leicht verfällt der Gelehrte . . . der Gefahr, ähnliche, ja gleiche literarische

[1] See R. Menéndez Pidal, "Sobre geografía folklórica. Ensayo de un método," *Revista de Filología Española*, VII (1920), 229-338, where he discusses the geographical aspects and implications of folk-ballad studies.

[2] No. 47 in *Danmarks gamle Folkeviser*, ed. Svend Grundtvig, Axel Olrik, Grüner Nielsen, Erik Abrahamsen (Copenhagen, 1853-1935).

[3] This theme is found in Scotland in the ballad *Clerk Colvill*, in Germany in the story of "der Ritter von Stauffenberg," and in France in *Le Roi Renaud*. See Francis J. Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (Boston and New York, 1882-98), I, 371-387.

[4] *Schlangenköchin* and *L'Avvelenato*.

Erscheinungen, Stoffe und Züge voneinander abzuleiten—während sie oft nur ein Ausfluß der gleichen Menschennatur sind, die unter gleichen Voraussetzungen auch zu gleichen Gedanken—oder Gefühlsäußerungen kommt.[5]

Nevertheless, while the possibility of independent origin must be recognized, the source of this European drowning theme is widely held to be the story of Hero and Leander, as it is first told by Ovid in his *Heroidum Epistolae,*[6] or as it appears in a poem of the fifth-century grammarian Musaeus.[7] This does not mean that the classical story is reproduced in its every detail in any one of its ballad forms. Generations of ballad singers throughout Europe have, as might be expected, emphasized and amplified the dramatic, tragic, and universal qualities of this famous theme; centuries of oral transmission have crystallized it into the fundamental idiom of ballad poetry. "Die Zeit hat das Gewand der Sage nach ihrer Sprache und die Wendungen geändert, und die Sage je nach dem neuen Lande und fremden Boden und Klima umgebildet."[8] Yet, although the classical story has been recreated as a ballad theme, and has been conceived and presented according to the traditions of the genre, its characteristic elements of theme and conception have endured. The difficulties confronting the lovers, Leander's tragic swim across the Hellespont, Hero's grief and despairing suicide, find frequent and close parallels in the folk literature of many lands; and it seems difficult to doubt that the vast family of ballads founded on such distinctive motifs was in fact engendered by Ovid's story.[9]

---

[5] "Die Schwimmersage," Part I, *Wissenschaftliche Beilage der Leipziger Zeitung* (Leipzig, 1907), p. 133. The term "drowning theme" is used in the present study in preference to a direct translation of the German "Schwimmersage."

[6] *Epistles,* XVIII ("Leander Heroni") and XIX ("Hero Leandro"). The text used here is that of the edition of Ovid's *Heroides* by Arthur Palmer (Oxford, 1898), pp. 123-138.

[7] *Carmen de Herone et Leandro,* in *Hesiodi Carmina,* ed. F. S. Lehrs (Paris, 1841), pp. 1-9. In *Euphorion,* XXIV (1922), 200-207, Paul Beyer reviews the dissertation by E. Rosenmüller, *Das Volkslied: Es waren zwei Königskinder* (Leipzig, 1917), and, in opposition to the view held by Rosenmüller, upholds the derivation of the drowning theme from the story of Hero and Leander. He stresses the "verwandte Motive" to be recognized in the ballads founded on the drowning theme and says: "wie ein Kern leuchtet die Hero- und Leandersage daraus hervor, ja man ist versucht, sie ihres Alters und ihrer Wirkung auf weite Kulturkreise halber als Ausgangspunkt der Schwimmersage überhaupt aufzufassen" (p. 206).

[8] L. Erk and F. Böhme, *Deutscher Liederhort* (Leipzig, 1893), I, 291.

[9] The origins of the story of Hero and Leander are uncertain. See notes in Arthur Palmer's edition of Ovid's *Heroides,* p. 455: "When and how the popular story arose is not clear. The simplest theory to hold is that the story is a fact which actually occurred in the first century B.C., and which the Romans became acquainted with in the time of Virgil . . . we only hear of the story in Virgil's time: had it existed from of old in the form of a myth it should have made its way into literature; and the way Virgil introduces it looks as if he accepted it as a fact." Mention is made, however, of the opposing view that "a local legend containing the outlines of the story existed from of old on the Hellespont attaching to the 'Tower of Hero' at Sestos . . . and that some Alexandrine poet . . . had the genius to perceive how very capable of poetical treatment that legend was, and worked it out with such success that it became the property of the world."

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN - KANSAS

The family stretches out to include ballads from Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, France, and Catalonia.[10] In this list the English speech domain is conspicuous by its absence. Indeed, in the third part of his essay, "Die Schwimmersage," Julius Sahr goes so far as to say: "Nur eins ist seltsam: England und Schottland fehlen ganz, meines Wissens haben wir unter den zahlreichen und schönen englisch-schottischen Balladen und Volksliedern keine Verwandten unserer Sage."[11] In Child's collection of English and Scottish ballads, however, there are four traditional songs from Scotland which, in theme and manner of presentation, bear many of the characteristic features of the drowning ballads.[12] The temptation to link this Scottish group to the great European chain is obvious. Whether we may with any justification yield to that temptation may best be judged by a comparison of the Scottish ballads, not only with the classical sources of the drowning theme, but also with one of the principal ballad versions of the story of Hero and Leander—with, for instance, the German version, *Die Königskinder*.

In the versions of *Die Königskinder* given in Meier's ballad collection,[13] the tragedy is unfolded, like a miniature drama, in a series of vivid episodes; the narrative seems to fall naturally into three distinct "acts." The most generally known High German version[14] presents the central situation and sets the tragedy in motion thus:

> Es waren zwei Königskinder,
> Die hatten einander so lieb,
> Sie konnten beisammen nicht kommen,
> Das Wasser war viel zu tief.[15]

---

[10] See John Meier, *Deutsche Volkslieder mit ihren Melodien* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1935-54, *Balladen*, I, 209-210.

[11] *Wissenschaftliche Beilage der Leipziger Zeitung* (Leipzig, 1907), p. 141.

[12] Francis J. Child, *op. cit.*, Nos. 215, 216 (IV, 178-191).

[13] John Meier includes in his collection eight versions of *Die Königskinder* (*op. cit.*, I, 197-203), and indicates the existence of over 300. The versions are distinguished in the present study by the numbers which they bear in Meier's edition.

[14] This version (5) is in Meier's words the "neuere gemeindeutsche Form" (*op. cit.*, I, 208), and is obviously derived from the most complete form of the ballad —the Low German version (3).

[15] The opening section of the ballad varies from version to version. There is, for example, the version which omits the initial presentation of the situation and begins instead with the conversation between mother and daughter—the so-called "Ach Mutter" version (4). And there are the versions based on the controversial "Elslein" stanza, a widespread but probably extraneous element in the ballad. For instance, the first version quoted by Meier is as follows:

> "Es warb ein schöner jüngling
> vber ein braiten see
> vmb eines Königes tochter,
> nach leid geschach jm wee.
> 'Ach elsslein, lieber bule,
> wie gern wer ich bey dir!
> so fliessen zwey tieffe wasser
> wol zwischen mir vnd dir.'"

This terse and informative statement sets the scene and suggests the problem. Immediately, the curtain rises on the first scene of the dramatic action. The impersonal narrative of the opening stanza comes to life, the style changes, and the viewpoint shifts as the princess herself entreats her lover to cross the dividing water. In some versions of the ballad the lovers are actually presented as writing to each other,[16] but in the High German version (5) the motif of the letter is not explicitly used and the method of communication left vague:

> "Ach, Schätzchen, könntest du schwimmen,
> So schwimm doch herüber zu mir!
> Drei Kerzchen will ich anzünden,
> Und die solln leuchten zu dir."

The narration is resumed; in the next stanza we hear how "ein falsches Nönnchen"[17] extinguishes the guiding candles and we are told of the death of the youth in the sea. Narration—vivid direct speech—narration; by this rapid switch of style and focus, the speed of the three introductory stanzas is increased until the moment when, with

> Der Jüngling ertrank so tief

the curtain falls on the first act of the ballad drama.

From this moment of tragedy, we are swept forward in time, transported to a different location, and introduced to a new set of characters, again grouped round the central figure of the girl.[18]

> Es war an ein'm Sonntagmorgen,

the dark night of the tragedy is past, and the dramatic tension momentarily relaxes; the second act will show as a bitter aftermath the girl's grief and yearning for her dead lover.

The difference in content of the first two acts is reflected in their contrasted style of presentation. The first tragic episode is set down starkly

---

[16] "Da schreib er jr herüber,
er kund wol schwimmen,
und bat sie da herwider,
sie solt jm wol zünden.

Da schreib sie jm hinwider
ein freundlichen gruss
und bot jm da herwider,
sie wolt es gern thun" (2).

and

"Es schrieb die Königstochter
dem Liebsten einen Brief,
in dem sie ihn voll Sehnsucht
zu sich herüber rief" (7).

[17] In one version (2), the motif of the nun does not appear, the treacherous woman being described simply as "ein wunderböses weib"; in version 6 the light is extinguished by "ein Mägdelein, ein falsches und böses Kind," and in version 8 by the wind.

[18] For a discussion of the break in this ballad's structure, see Francis B. Gummere, *The Popular Ballad* (London, Boston, and New York, 1907), pp. 85-93.

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN
KANSAS

and swiftly in twelve taut lines; the slow, dragging period of reaction and loneliness which the girl must then endure stretches over seven stanzas, so constructed that they retard the pace, emphasize the passage of time, and gradually build up an overwhelming impression of her longing and love. This slackening of pace, combined with a relentless increase of tension, is achieved by a device beloved of the ballad singer and christened by Gummere "incremental repetition."[19]

While in the first section of the ballad the girl is presented in relation to her lover and the treacherous nun, now, in the second section, we see her, grief-stricken, against the background of her family. This entire passage consists of an exchange of conversation in repetitive form between the girl and her mother, with indirect reference to her brother and sister:

"Ach Mutter, herzliebste Mutter,
Der Kopf tut mir so weh;
Ich möcht' so gern spazieren
Wohl an die grüne See."

"Ach Tochter, herzliebste Tochter,
Allein sollst du nicht gehn.
Weck' auf deine jüngste Schwester,
Und die soll mit dir gehn."

The girl, overwhelmed by her experience of love and suffering, and consciously isolated by it from her family, spurns the childish company of her sister and rejects, too, the company of her brother. While she pleads for solitude and while her mother offers useless advice, the gulf of misunderstanding widens. Again the scene changes abruptly and the girl, in the toils of love and grief, finally turns her back on mother, father, and religion.

Die Mutter ging nach der Kirche,
Die Tochter hielt ihren Gang...

She bribes a fisherman to put out his net and search for the dead body of her lover:

Der erste Fisch, den er fischet,
Das war sich des Königs Sohn.

Sie fasst' ihn in ihre Arme
Und küsst' seinen toten Mund...

She rewards the fisherman with her golden crown and ring and, thus divested of all royal distinction, greets her lover as a woman rather than as a princess. Just as the first stage of the tragedy was accomplished swiftly and starkly, so is its culmination:

Sie schwang um sich ihren Mantel
Und sprang wohl in die See:

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 90.

"Gut' Nacht, mein Vater und Mutter,
Ihr seht mich nimmermehr."

The memory of this great tragic ballad stirs when, as we read through Child's collection, we come upon four Scottish ballads, clearly based on a common theme.[20] Each tells of a youth, drowned on the way to visit his love. These ballads are: *Rare Willie drowned in Yarrow* and *The Water o Gamrie* (linked together by Child as southern and northern versions of the same theme); *Annan Water*, added to this ballad group (No. 215) as an appendix; and, closely related in theme and character, though classified independently (No. 206), *The Mother's Malison*, or *Clyde's Water*.

The most lyrical and least circumstantial of these four ballads is *Rare Willie drowned in Yarrow*. In the three forms in which it is presented by Child, this ballad suggests rather than tells a story. Details are few; the action is seen solely from the point of view of the girl; the tragedy is presented poignantly in terms of her anxiety and mourning. The situation is established and the love theme introduced in the graceful first stanza:

"Willy's rare, and Willy's fair,
And Willy's wondrous bony,
And Willy heght to marry me,
Gin eer he marryd ony" [A].[21]

This tranquil atmosphere is abruptly shattered, and we see the girl's calm hopes turned to terrified anxiety for Willy's welfare:

She sought him east, she sought him west,
She sought him brade and narrow;
Sine, in the clifting of a craig,
She found him drownd in Yarrow [A].

One version (A), ends on this tragic climax; the others however continue beyond the tragedy and include its aftermath:

She's taen three links of her yellow hair,
That hung down lang and yellow,
And she's tied it about sweet Willie's waist,
An drawn him out o Yarrow [B].

In version C we then hear again the voice of the girl, mourning her drowned lover and swearing eternal fidelity to him:

"There's neer a man lie by my side
Since Willie's drowned in Yarrow."

This ballad affords a clear example of what Entwistle calls "the magic of words unspoken."[22] Though the emotion which it conveys is real and

[20] See note 12 above.

[21] The versions are lettered here according to the system used by Child in his collection.

[22] William J. Entwistle, *European Balladry* (Oxford, 1939), p. 124.

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN - KANSAS

strong, the details of the narrative are shadowy and we can only guess at their substance. A much more explicit version of the same theme is found in *Annan Water*, where many of the words unspoken in the ballad of Yarrow are given expression, though in the process some magic is lost.

Here again a tragedy of love is unfolded, and the seeds of that tragedy are already implicit in the opening stanza:

> "Annan water's wading deep,
> And my love Annie's wondrous bonny,
> And I am laith she suld weet her feet,
> Because I love her best of ony."

There follows immediately a dramatic account of the youth's attempt to cross the river barrier to his love. By the device of incremental repetition, with its insidious emotional effect, the pace steadily quickens, the youth's struggle against overwhelming odds appears ever more hopeless, the inevitability of the tragedy is increasingly obvious:

> He has loupen on the bonny black,
> He stirrd him wi the spur right sairly;
> But, or he wan the Gatehope-Slack,
> I think the steed was wae and weary.
>
> He has loupen on the bonny grey,
> He rade the right gate and the ready;
> I trow he would neither stint nor stay,
> For he was seeking his bonny ladye.

We hear of the wild ride of the youth on his "bonny grey" until, exhausted, he reaches the Annan. There he invokes the help of a boatman; the boatman, however, refuses to ferry him across and thereby brings the tragic climax a stage nearer. Despairingly the youth plunges into the river, and is gradually overwhelmed:

> He has taen the ford at that stream tail;
> I wot he swam both strong and steady;
> But the stream was broad, and his strength did fail,
> And he never saw his bonny ladye!

There now occurs in the ballad a break, a pause of grief, followed by a short dirge spoken by Annie, for whose love the youth has died. These two stanzas speak her utter fidelity to him and her deep longing for reunion:

> "O wae betide the fresh saugh wand!
> And wae betide the bush of brier!
> It brake into my true-love's hand,
> When his strength did fail, and his limbs did tire.
>
> And wae betide ye, Annan Water,
> This night that ye are a drumlie river!
> For over thee I'll build a þridge,
> That ye never more true love may sever."

Another distinctive version of the basic drowning theme is found in *The Water o Gamrie*. In this ballad, as opposed to *Rare Willie drowned in Yarrow* and *Annan Water*, the narrative elements far outweigh the lyrical and the theme is supported by a variety of details. While in the other ballads Willie braves the river to keep a vague tryst with his love, in this version it is his wedding day, and his bride awaits him on the far side of the Gamrie. An important feature of this ballad drama is the part played in it by Willie's mother who, in almost every variant, stands between the lovers. As the ballad opens, the interest is focused on her as she attempts either to persuade or threaten them into renouncing each other. In two versions (D and H) she gives Willie her blessing; elsewhere she is presented as withholding that blessing (G), predicting his death (F), or actually laying her curse upon him (E). Despite his mother's intervention, however, Willie sets off for his wedding across the river Gamrie, as thus in version G:

> The firsten step that Willie stept,
> He steppit to the bellie;
> The wind blew loud, the stream ran proud,
> And awa wi it gaed Willie.

At the kirk o Gamrie, Margaret, waiting for her bridegroom, learns of his death. Her reaction to the news is presented, in all versions of the ballad, in three stages—in three illuminating glimpses of her grief, search, and suicide.

> She tore the ribbons aff her head,
> That were baith rich and manie,
> And she has kiltit up her coat,
> And ran to the water o Ganrie.
>
> She's sought him up, sae did she doun,
> Thro' a' the water o Ganrie;
> In the deepest weil in a' the burn,
> Oh, there she fand her Willie!
>
> She has taen him in her arms twa,
> Sae fondly as she kisst him!
> Said, "My mither sall be wae as thine,"
> And she's lain doun aside him.

In *Clyde's Water* the motif of the mother is greatly emphasized, in fact dominates and colors the basic theme. From the outset all attention is directed upon the clash between Willie, fired with love of Margaret, and his mother, determined to keep him in her grasp. Willie is stubborn in his love and his mother, thwarted, lays her curse upon him:

> "O an ye gang to Meggie's bower,
> Sae sair against my will,
> The deepest pot in Clyde's water,
> My malison ye's feel."

In this version (C) Willie braves the curse and rides off to visit his love. Soon he sees Clyde's water stretching challengingly before him:

> "O roaring Clyde, ye roar ower loud,
> Your streams seem wondrous strang;
> Make me your wreck as I come back,
> But spare me as I gang!"

He wins through, reaches his true love's home, "tirls at the pin" and is answered, and curtly dismissed, by a voice which seems to be Margaret's. In distress Willie turns homeward and for the second time is faced by the barrier of the Clyde:

> He leand him ower his saddle-bow,
> To catch his hat thro force;
> The rushing that was in Clyde's water
> Took Willie frae his horse.

Meanwhile, Margaret has wakened from sleep and is told by her deceitful mother of Willie's visit and departure. She rushes anxiously from the house and, when she reaches the Clyde, wades in in search of Willie and finds him in "the deepest pot." The concluding stanza, spoken by the girl, sums up the tragedy:

> "You've had a cruel mither, Willie,
> And I have had anither;
> But we shall sleep in Clyde's water
> Like sister an like brither."

Being thus acquainted with the Scottish ballad group and remembering the German *Die Königskinder*, we may now consider their possible kinship as descendants of Ovid's story of Hero and Leander. Any attempt to establish a connection between the German and Scottish ballads on a chronological basis would be fruitless; for, in both cases, the problem of dating is one which scarcely admits of solution. As far as the German drowning ballad is concerned, many theories have been advanced to explain the development of its various forms and to determine the date of the original ballad. According to John Meier,[23] the drowning theme appears to have been carried from south to north Germany, taking root there and spreading further again in its Low German form. The tradition of this ballad theme has been traced as far back as the sixteenth century. From evidence provided by the different versions, it has further been deduced that the ballad must in fact have been in existence in the fifteenth century. As far as the Scottish ballad group is concerned, Child goes no further than to recognize the southern (Yarrow) version of the theme as older than the northern (Gamrie) version. Of these ballads, the oldest printed record, again according

[23] I, 210-213. See also *Das deutsche Volkslied, Balladen*, Part I, ed. John Meier (Leipzig, 1936), pp. 59-60.

to Child,[24] is that of *Rare Willie drowned in Yarrow*, version A, as it appears in W. Thomson's *Orpheus Caledonius* (London, 1773), II, 110. *Clyde's Water*, while having much in common with these ballads of Yarrow and Gamrie, appears contaminated by elements of other themes—*The Lass of Roch Royal* and *Child Waters*, for example—and its earliest version quoted by Child (B) was, according to him, taken down from recitation "apparently in 1800."[25] As for *Annan Water*, mention was made of it in 1729, in Ramsay's *Tea-Table Miscellany*.[26] A possible original version was printed towards the end of the seventeenth century or at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The most, however, that Child is prepared to admit in the case of this ballad is "that 'Anna Water,' " in Ramsay's language, is one of the "Scots poems wrote by the ingenious before 1800."[27]

It seems therefore that, in the absence of any chronological facts, a thematic and stylistic analysis is the only possible basis for the comparison of the Scottish ballads and *Die Königskinder* as possible descendants of the classical story. Only by examining the degree and quality of similarity existing between Ovid's story and the German and Scottish ballads can one hope to illuminate the problem of their kinship.

The points of resemblance between Ovid's version and *Die Königskinder*, as regards theme and motifs, are obvious. The German ballad, however, while presenting more or less the same basic theme as Ovid, presents it from a different viewpoint. Ovid shows a situation and its potential tragedy; *Die Königskinder* considers the situation retrospectively and presents the tragedy accomplished. Events which are merely imagined in the Ovid version are, in *Die Königskinder*, fact. Tragedy threatens but does not yet befall Hero and Leander; it is the aftermath of the lovers' tragedy which, in the German ballad, receives the emphasis.

Apart from this difference in viewpoint, the elements of both situation and tragedy in Ovid's version and in *Die Königskinder* are strikingly similar. Ovid shows the lovers, unhappily parted by water, longing for each other and exchanging letters; this is precisely the situation with which most variants of the German ballad open. Yet, while the lovers' situation is presented in detail in Ovid's *Epistles* and occupies, in fact, the major part of the text, in *Die Königskinder* its details are merely sketched in and its importance is slight in the framework of the whole ballad. Thus, the weight in *Die Königskinder* does not fall, as in Ovid's version, on the motifs of love and separation; nor is emphasis given to the youth's swim, an important episode in the

[24] See Child's introductory notes to the ballad *Rare Willie drowned in Yarrow*, *op. cit.*, IV, 178-179.
[25] *Op. cit.*, IV, 188.
[26] Dublin, 1729, I, 105.
[27] *Op. cit.*, IV, 184.

LIBRARY APR 11 1957 MANHATTAN KANSAS

classical presentation. The storm which is stressed by Ovid as a potential cause of tragedy scarcely appears in the German ballad, where interest is focused on the guiding light and the added motif of the nun's treachery. Similarly, the hindrance motif, represented in Ovid's version not only by the storm but also by Leander's parents,[28] is in the German ballad reflected mainly in the figure of the nun.[29]

On the other hand, certain motifs assume much greater significance in *Die Königskinder* than they did in Ovid's version. The guiding light is a crucial factor in the tragedy of the *Königskinder*, while its importance for the classical Leander was not indicated explicitly but merely by suggestion. In the same way, the nun of the German ballad plays a much more active part than does Ovid's nurse. The girl's conversation with her mother, which forms a large part of *Die Königskinder*, is an addition independent of the Latin source. The finding of the youth's body, a hypothetical episode in the classical version, assumes great dramatic importance in the German form. What Ovid presented as Hero's dream of ill omen[30] and Leander's foreboding of doom[31] is given in detailed fulfillment. The fisherman episode is not a part of Ovid's version. The girl's grief is common to both presentations and, while her suicide is not actually indicated by Ovid, it is shown to be compatible with her character and the nature of her love for Leander.[32] Thus, while the motifs of the light, letters, hindrance, swim, drowning, grief, and even suicide are common to both Ovid's version and the German ballad, though presented with varying degree of stress, the ballad has acquired the extraneous motifs of the nun's treachery and the fisherman, and gives no place to the girl's dream or to the storm or to the hindrance afforded by the youth's parents.[33]

---

[28] See note 37 below.

[29] See note 17 above.

[30] "Hic ego ventosas nantem delphina per undas
Cernere non dubia sum mihi visa fide,
Quem postquam bibulis inlisit fluctus harenis,
Unda simul miserum vitaque deseruit.
Quidquid id est, timeo . . ."
(*Epistle* XIX, "Hero Leandro," lines 199-203).

[31] "Aut mihi contiget felix audacia salvo,
Aut mors solliciti finis amoris erit.
Optabo tamen, ut partis expellar in illas,
Et teneant portus naufraga membra tuos.
Flebis enim tactuque meum dignabere corpus,
Et 'mortis' dices 'huic ego causa fui.'"
(*Epistle* XVIII, "Leander Heroni," lines 195-200).

[32] See, for instance, the passage in which Hero expresses her fear that Leander may be unfaithful to her:

"Quodsi quam sciero, moriar, mihi crede, dolendo:
Iamdudum pecca, si mea fata petis."
(*Epistle* XIX, "Hero Leandro," lines 117-118)

[33] Paul Beyer in his review of Rosenmüllers dissertation on *Die Königskinder* (see note 7) writes: "Eine sehr dankenswerte Aufgabe wäre es nun, einmal den

When we come to examine the Scottish ballad group we find that its drowning theme is crystallized into the same fundamental episodes and motifs as is the theme of Ovid's story and of the German ballad. Just as in the case of Leander and the *Königskind*, the story of Willie is presented in terms of love and frustration—in the episodes of the youth's swim, difficulties, and death, the girl's grief and search, the discovery of her dead lover, her suicide.[34] As in the German ballad the tragedy is viewed retrospectively, its episodes receiving varied emphasis from version to version. As might be expected, in the predominantly lyrical ballad, *Rare Willie drowned in Yarrow*, the stress falls on the emotional aspects of the tragedy—love, grief, and mourning—while in *Annan Water, Clyde's Water*, and *The Water o Gamrie*, which adhere to the traditions of the essentially narrative ballad, the crudely dramatic and factual episodes are thrown into sharp relief.

In the exposition of the initial situation the Scottish ballads at once recall Ovid's version. The ballad of Yarrow and some variants of *The Water o Gamrie* convey, in their lyrical praise of Willie, rare and fair, the happiness but not the frustration of the lovers' circumstances; *Clyde's Water* allows the situation to emerge starkly and realistically from the dialogue; but *Annan Water* expresses fully the facts of the lovers' position, and corresponds closely in spirit to the exposition of Ovid's story, just as closely as does *Die Königskinder*.

The classical letter motif is entirely lacking in the Scottish ballads, but the episode of the youth's swim across the dividing water, though absent in *Rare Willie drowned in Yarrow*, appears in the other versions and is in fact swollen by circumstantial evidence to far greater proportions than it assumes in *Die Königskinder*. While the German ballad states succinctly, "Der Jüngling ertrank so tief," *The Water o Gamrie* recalls Ovid's version by dwelling at some length on the drama of Willie's crossing; in the same way almost the whole of *Annan Water* is devoted to the hero's conflict with the elements. It is in *Clyde's Water*, however, that the episode is presented most significantly. Willie, in this

Gesamtaufbau des germanischen Liedes mit der antiken Sage zu vergleichen: In beiden steht Hero unbedingt im Mittelpunkt—das tritt im Verlauf des Zersingens unseres Volksliedes noch deutlicher als ursprünglich zu Tage—aber sehr auffallend ist doch die selbständige Ausgestaltung solcher Einzelepisoden, wie Mädchen und Mutter, Mädchen und Fischer. Ist die Vorliebe der germanischen Ballade, zu Zwiegesprächen fortzuschreiten, daran Schuld? Liegt in dieser selbständigen Ausgestaltung, dieser Aneinanderreihung gleichbrechtigter Einzelszenen vielleicht ein germanisches Stilelement?" (*loc. cit.*, pp. 206-207).

[34] The difference in the names of hero and heroine does not necessarily indicate that they are of different origin. Wilhelm Heiske in his article, "Königskinder und Elsleinstrophe," *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1932), pp. 35 ff., describes the disappearance of the antique names as "eine natürliche Erscheinung," irrelevant to the problem of derivation (p. 37). "Auf langem Weg aus alter Sage über mittelalterliche Spielmannsdichtung," he says, "haben sie [die Königskinder] ... jeden Namen abgestoßen" (p. 51).

LIBRARY APR 11 1957 MANHATTAN KANSAS

ballad, crosses the river safely to his love and meets his death only on the return journey. His fate is anticipated in the couplet which he addresses to the river:

> "Make me your wreck as I come back,
> But spare me as I gang!"

This couplet appears also in a broadside of the mid-seventeenth century which has as its title and theme *The Tragedy of Hero and Leander*.[35] It is a quotation from an epigram of Martial:

> Cum peteret dulces audax Leandros amores
> Et fessus tumidis iam premeretur aquis,
> Sic miser instantes adfatus dicitur undas:
> "Parcite dum propero, mergite cum redeo,"[36]

and re-echoes Leander's words from Ovid's *Epistle* XVIII:

> "Siqua fides vero est, veniens hinc esse natator,
> Cum redeo, videor naufragus esse mihi."
> ("Leander Heroni," lines 119-20).

In like manner, the hindrance motif plays a part also in the Scottish ballads. It is not presented as in *Die Königskinder* in the form of treachery; indeed, as in a few German variants, the guiding light does not appear at all. In the Scottish ballads the motif of hindrance is presented rather, as it was in Ovid's version, in the form of Leander's parents.[37] In *Annan Water* a suggestion of the hindrance motif may perhaps be seen in the shadowy form of the boatman;[38] in the circum-

---

[35] Or *The Two Unfortunate Lovers*. In *The Roxburghe Ballads*, ed. Ebsworth (Hertford, 1871-97), VI, 558-559. The words (line 12) are almost exactly as in the folk ballad: "Make me a wrack as I come back, but spare me as I go."

[36] *Epigrammaton liber*, XXVb. In *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri*, ed. L. Friedländer (Leipzig, 1886), I, 156-157.

See also Martial's *Apophoreta* (*Epigrammaton liber*, XIV), No. CLXXXI, Friedländer, II, 335:

> "LEANDROS MARMOREUS.
> Clamabat tumidis audax Leandros in undis:
> 'Mergite me fluctus, cum rediturus ero.'"

[37] Only his parents' watchful eyes, says Leander, prevented him from coming to Hero by boat:

> "Non poteram celare meos, velut ante, parentes."
> (*Epistle* XVIII, "Leander Heroni," line 13).

Hero, in the same way, envisages this reason for her lover's absence:

> "An vigilant omnes, et timet ille suos?"
> (*Epistle* XIX, "Hero Leandro," line 42).

[38] It is interesting to compare, in this connection, the English folk song, *The Water of Tyne* (in *North Countrie Ballads, Songs and Pipe-tunes*, ed. and arr. W. G. Whittaker, London, 1921, No. 33, p. 100, part II). In the three stanzas of this song a girl seeks a boatman who will ferry her across the river Tyne to her lover or bring him over to her. The opening of the song is particularly reminiscent of the initial situation of *Annan Water* and *Die Königskinder*:

> "I cannot get to my love if I would dee,
> The water of Tyne runs between him and me;
> And here I must stand with the tear in my e'e,
> Both sighing and sickly my sweet-heart to see."

stantial *The Water o Gamrie*, however, it is clearly embodied in the figure of the youth's mother. It occupies an even more significant place in the dramatic action of *Clyde's Water*; there the treachery is strong and twofold. It is symbolized by the two mothers, the one malevolently laying a curse on her son Willie, while the other turns him deceitfully from Margaret's door and thus sends him to his death.

As was indicated earlier, the episodes of the girl's search, tragic discovery, and grief—episodes merely foreshadowed in Ovid's version—find their most satisfying expression, within the Scottish ballad group, in *Rare Willie drowned in Yarrow*. The evocative, lyrical approach of this ballad is, as one would expect, infinitely more suited to the expression of emotion than are the narrative ballads. The major section of *Die Königskinder*, for instance, is devoted to the cumulative presentation of the girl's anxiety; in the ballad of Yarrow (A) this emotion is conveyed no less convincingly by the single stanza of distraught questioning:

> "O came you by yon water-side?
> Pu'd you the rose or lilly?
> Or came you by yon meadow green?
> Or saw you my sweet Willy?"

Similarly, the discovery episode, presented in the German ballad in a starkly realistic manner, is delicately conceived in *Rare Willie drowned in Yarrow*. While in *Die Königskinder* the fisherman casts his net in search of the dead youth, in the Scottish ballad it is the girl who, using her hair as a net, draws her lover's body from the river. This episode was no more than suggested by Ovid, yet the manner in which he suggests it is recalled by one of the versions of *Rare Willie drowned in Yarrow*. In version C, the actual tragedy is foreshadowed by a dream of ill omen dreamed by the girl—a symbolic dream as was Hero's:[39]

> "O sister dear, I've dreamed a dream,
> I'm afraid it's unco sorrow;
> I dreamed I was pu'in the heather green,
> In the dowie dens o Yarrow."
>
> "O sister dear, I'll read your dream . . .
> Your lover's drowned in Yarrow."

In *Annan Water* the finding of the youth is shrouded in silence; in *The Water o Gamrie* it is conceived in narrative rather than emotional terms; grief-stricken, the girl tears her hair and, as in *Clyde's Water*, searches far and wide, finding her love at last in the river's depths. Only *The Water o Gamrie*, however, offers a final glimpse of Margaret:

> She has taen him in her arms twa,
> Sae fondly as she kisst him!
> Said, "My mither sall be wae as thine,"
> And she's lain doun aside him [G].

[39] See note 30 above.

This stanza, and indeed the search and discovery scenes of all of the Scottish ballads, clearly recall the corresponding episodes in Ovid's poem.[40] Leander visualizes his own death and Hero's grief and self-reproach.[41] And just as in one of the German *Königskinder* ballads—the second variant quoted by John Meier—the girl, in the moment of her suicide, cries:

> "es sol vmb meinetwillen
> ertrincken kein Ritter mee!"

so does Margaret, of the Scottish ballads, die of grief and remorse:

> "But now since Willie has dy'd for me,
> I will sleep wi him in the same grave at Gemrie."
> (*The Water o Gamrie*, H)

Thus, while the guiding light plays no part in the Scottish ballads, the initial situation of the lovers is clearly stated and the storm, swimming, hindrance, dream, discovery, and suicide motifs are of first importance. In some respects, therefore, the Scottish ballad tragedy approximates more closely to the pattern of Ovid's story than does *Die Königskinder*.

Clearly the analysis of the Scottish ballad group and *Die Königskinder* has shown the resemblance existing between them, not only in the surface details of the theme but also in its conception and presentation. The thematic resemblance may, of course, well be coincidental. It is true that the folk literature of the English language shares with that of Germany a great store of phrases, images, and themes. "Der ganze Ton dieser Poesien ist so einförmig," says Herder, "daß man oft Wort für Work übersetzen, Wendung für Wendung, Inversion gegen Inversion übertragen kann."[42] It is also true in this particular case that the theme of the Scottish ballads is, in its details, slight enough and commonplace enough to admit of an independent and local origin. In fact, it would be quite unjustifiable to base any conclusions on thematic resemblance alone. Resemblance in conception and presentation of thematic material, however, cannot be so easily explained away in terms of coincidence. And, as we have seen, the treatment which the drowning theme receives in the Scottish ballads resembles so closely the presentation of the parallel theme in German balladry that we may suspect the existence of some contact stronger than the natural basic correspondence of all folk ballads.

---

[40] The discovery and suicide episodes in the Scottish and German ballads recall, as do many of their scenes and images, the poem *Hero and Leander* by Christopher Marlowe and George Chapman. In it Hero's grief and death are described thus:

> "She fell on her love's bosom, hugg'd it fast,
> And with Leander's name she breath'd her last."

[41] See note 31 above.

[42] "Von Ähnlichkeit der mittlern englischen und deutschen Dichtkunst," in *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Suphan (Berlin, 1877-1913), IX, 526.

The nature of that contact is suggested by the resemblance which both Scottish and German ballads bear to Ovid's story of Hero and Leander. The Scottish ballads, no less than the German, are linked to the classical version factually, by the superficial resemblance of theme, but also artistically, by a chain of characteristic motifs and episodes. If, on the basis of this artistic link, one accepts *Die Königskinder* as a descendant of Ovid's version, must one not also recognize the comparable pattern of resemblance, existing between the classical story and the Scottish ballads, as similar evidence of kinship? It would be dangerous, of course, to attach too much importance to the degree of similarity which the Scottish ballads bear to the Latin version on the one hand and to the German ballad on the other. Nevertheless, it seems that we may with a reasonable amount of justification link together the German ballad of *Die Königskinder* and the four Scottish ballads from Yarrow, Gamrie, Clyde, and Annan—link them together as traditional presentations of the same tragic situation and accordingly admit the presence, in Scottish ballad literature, of the great European theme of Hero and Leander.

University of Glasgow

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN
KANSAS

THE POSTWAR POLISH HISTORICAL NOVEL

XENIA GASIOROWSKA

THE peculiar position of the historical novel in Polish literature is conditioned by the peculiarities of Polish history. This genre emerged in Poland in the middle of the nineteenth century and, until the end of World War I, was oriented to maintain the captive nation's morale. In the following twenty years, when Poland was independent, the historical novel developed within the framework of general literary and intellectual trends. Since the end of World War II, its fortunes have been determined by political conditions, particularly since 1949, when the canons of socialist realism were imposed.[1]

To a nation partitioned, deprived of its political independence, and subjected to three different forms of denationalizing policies, the historical novel meant more than mere entertainment. It fostered national pride and unity, and "sustained Polish hearts"[2] by reviving a glorious past, as in the works of Sienkiewicz. It "ripped open the wounds of Poland to prevent them from healing over with scabs of baseness,"[3] by recalling past mistakes as well as tragedies, as in the works of Żeromski. It kept green the memories of centuries gone by painting their fictional portrait at the time when Polish history was banished from schools—Jeż, Kaczkowski, Kraszewski. This traditional historical novel was nationalistic in theme,[4] patriotic in spirit, and conventional as a genre—a typical romance of adventure with a historical setting. It created a great number of lively, unforgettable characters; it excelled in characterization and in vividness of plot; but it did not aspire either to deep psychological insight or to an impartial evaluation of historical events.

Poland's reappearance as an independent state after World War I deprived the patriotic historical novel of its former *raison d'être*; the literature of independent Poland in the first decade of its existence was intent on the problems of the present rather than on those of the past, and the popularity of historical fiction waned. The 1930s brought a degree of revived interest in the genre, but the works appearing in that

[1] For a general survey of Polish postwar literature, see K. Hartmann, "Das literarische Schaffen in Polen seit 1944," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*, V (1956), 181-232.

[2] In spite of Sienkiewicz's specific statement of his purpose in the closing words of his *Trilogy*, his intention has been questioned. K. Wyka, "Sprawa Sienkiewicza," *Twórczość*, II (Jan. 1946), 91.

[3] S. Żeromski, *Sułkowski*, in *Utwory dramatyczne*, III (Cracow, 1929), 126.

[4] Two significant exceptions are *Faraon* (1897) by B. Prus and *Quo Vadis?* (1896) by H. Sienkiewicz; but veiled political allusions to Poland's captivity are detected by literary critics even in these pictures of ancient Egypt and Rome.

period did not follow any definite trend, the choice of the historical setting and its treatment reflecting primarily the authors' various interests, such as antiquity,[5] mediaeval Catholicism,[6] or psychology.[7] Polish national history, no longer the exclusive topic, was moreover in many instances subjected to critical re-evaluation by fiction writers. Several works were dedicated to the so-called "debunking" of historical personages, destroying the romantically heroic reputation established by the traditional school.[8] An attempt toward revising the artistic presentation of the high points of Poland's struggle for independence, namely the insurrections in the nineteenth century, is of particular interest because, since its emphasis shifted from the *szlachta* (gentry) to the peasantry, it became the precursor of a specific type of historical novel in the so-called "People's Poland" after World War II.[9] The interest in the origins of Poland prevalent among Polish historians, anthropologists, archaeologists, and linguists throughout the whole twenty-year period of independence resulted in many scholarly works on the subject,[10] but found no echo in historical fiction until the years of German occupation. In these bleak years, however, several novels of real value were produced and, when published after the end of the war, inaugurated a new era in Polish literature.

The Poland of the Piasts—the beginnings of the Polish state under its first rulers, Mieszko I (ca. 960-992) and Boleslaw the Brave (992-1025)—had never appealed before as a topic to the great historical novelists. Possibly, the reason for this was the scarcity of historical material before World War I and, in the twenty years of independence, the very remoteness of the period, which rendered it an ungrateful ground for the projection of psychological problems in vogue among modern writers. The debacle wrought by World War II, however, caused several writers to find solace in the grandeur of Poland's beginnings, and seek hope in the successful struggle of the first Piasts against a powerful Germany. Apparently it also awakened their curiosity in the Piast era as a new cycle of civilization analogous in its breadth and complexity to that of our own times. Present-day Polish critics even tend to ascribe the authors' thematic choice to their interest in the newly regained ter-

[5] E.g., T. Parnicki, *Aecjusz, ostatni Rzymianin* (1937) and J. Parandowski, *Dysk Olimpijski.*

[6] E.g., Z. Kossak-Szczucka, *Krzyżowcy* (1935).

[7] E.g., J. Iwaszkiewicz, *Czerwone tarcze* (1935).

[8] E.g., T. Boy-Żeleński, *Marysieńka Sobieska* (1938), a *vie romancée*, meant to scandalize the conservative reader—and succeeding.

[9] L. Kruczkowski's *Kordian i Cham* (1932) is today the acknowledged model of books which, in the words of a critic, "deeply harrow the soil of our historical legend glorifying the hamletism of the *szlachta*." J. Preger, "Nowa powieść T. Hołuja," *Nowa Kultura*, No. 32 (1955).

[10] The work has been further intensified since World War II because of the approaching date of the Polish millennium (A.D. 963).

ritories in the West, which in the time of the Piasts were an integral part of Poland.[11]

The novels dedicated to the Poland of the Piasts have one common feature—monumentality.[12] Apart from this feature, the subject is treated from many different angles. Bunsch and Grabski take full advantage of the picturesque background and the exciting events of the era. Fictional characters and their adventures dominate the scene, and the emphasis is on the plot. Parnicki's novel is much more profound and more erudite; he features subtle mediaeval diplomacy, and uses modern psychological methods in drawing a startling portrait of Emperor Otto III "in a daring experiment at psychoanalysis applied to a distant past."[13] Gołubiew's *Bolesław the Brave* is an outstanding novel, comparable with such masterpieces as Undset's *Kristin Lavransdatter* and Alexei Tolstoy's *Peter the First*. It is a portrait of an era, of a nation being born and joining the family of European nations under the leadership of a great statesman. Despite its title, the novel is not a *vie romancée* of Bolesław; the real hero is the people, shown in a multitude of fictional characters in a network of numerous secondary plots. The book follows a pattern of progress developing on two planes: political (the consolidation of the state) and spiritual (the nation's Christianization). The book and its fate in postwar Poland deserve more space and attention than can be given within the scope of the present article.

These novels did not survive the advent of socialist realism, which designated them as "alien in spirit to the principles of realism, and generally tending to promote reactionary theses on the struggle between the world of Christianity and that of paganism."[14] Mediaeval themes nevertheless have continued very popular with Polish writers. The Middle Ages remain a favorite haunt of several Catholic authors who portray spiritual problems in an atmosphere saturated with religious feeling, and sound a nonconformist note in postwar Polish literature. These books,[15] published by private Catholic firms, remain, naturally,

[11] M. Rzeuska, "Kronika dwu Piastów we współczesnej powieści," *Odrodzenie*, No. 33 (1948).

[12] K. Bunsch, *Dzikowy skarb* (1945) and *Ojciec i syn* (1947)—four volumes followed in 1949 by *Imiennik* in two parts; W. Grabski, *Saga o Jarlu Broniszu*, planned as a trilogy of which, however, only Part I has appeared (1949); T. Parnicki, after publishing the two volumes of *Srebrne Orły* (Jerusalem, 1944-45; 2nd ed., Warsaw, 1949), announced the three other parts of the cycle *Królewski Szczep Piastowy*; finally, A. Gołubiew's cycle, *Bolesław Chrobry*, in six parts, of which *Puszcza* and *Szło Nowe*, written during the war (1940-1944) and published in 1946, *Złe dni* (2 vols., 1950), and *Rozdroża* (2 vols., 1954-55) have been published to date. The two remaining parts, *Żelazne słupy* and *Korona*, are expected to bring the whole to eight or ten volumes, each averaging 400 pages.

[13] J. K. Dębowski, "Nasza dzisiejsza powieść o średniowieczu," *Nauka i Sztuka*, No. 4 (Apr. 1946), p. 26.

[14] J Skórnicki, "Kłopoty epiki historycznej," *Życie Literackie*, No. 34 (1954).

[15] E.g., H. Malewska's *Kamienie wołać, będą* (1946) and *Przemija postać świata* (1954); J. Dobraczyński's *Dwa stosy* (1947) and *Klucz mądrości* (1953).

outside the pale of socialist realism. One author insists that they have their place, because "a Catholic and a Marxist understand each other when they speak of an art serving an important ideal."[16] Still, a plurality of ideals being unacceptable to Marxism, these works must be considered as belonging to a separate group. On the other hand, as will be shown later, several followers of the tenets of socialist realism have been able to find mediaeval material suitable for their books.

A discussion of socialist realism as a creative literary method is not pertinent to the subject of this article, particularly since its basic—and recently controversial[17]—aspect, the presentation of current reality, does not affect historical fiction. Yet the adoption of socialist realism has pledged Polish literature to its other basic aspect—the task of educating the masses in the spirit of socialism. In order to serve this purpose, literature has to meet two conditions: works must be planned in advance thematically and editorially, and they must be produced by ideologically reliable authors and evaluated by similarly qualified critics. It is frankly recognized that such planned and organized literature cannot aspire to great artistic values, but this consideration is apparently unimportant. "A great literature," remarks a critic, "usually arrives unplanned and even often unexpected; a good literature, however, must be planned and everything should be done in order to have it."[18]

The days when historical themes were considered escapist and their choice "an insult to present-day realities"[19] are long past in the Soviet Union and, consequently, did not even dawn in postwar Poland. Historical fiction is granted full citizenship but requires careful handling, and certain aspects are watchfully observed by the critics. The author's Marxist ideological soundness is, naturally, considered a *conditio sine qua non* for the proper presentation of historical events.[20] Another condition is his ability to show the ties connecting the past with the present, namely, the presence in every era of two opposite social "undercurrents" of the class struggle.[21] Emotional factors need not be discarded—Poles are traditionally romantic[22]—but they should be properly chan-

[16] J. Dobraczyński, "Pisarze wobec dziesięciolecia," *Nowa Kultura*, No. 2 (1955).

[17] See G. Struve, "The Second Congress of Soviet Writers," *Problems of Communism*, IV (1955); X. Gasiorowska, "Recent Trends in Soviet Literature," *Modern Language Forum*, XXXIX (1954).

[18] M. Kierczyńska, "Walczmy o literaturę dnia dzisiejszego," *Nowa Kultura*, No. 25 (1954).

[19] A. Efremin, "Literatura i iskusstvo," *Novyi Mir*, Mar. 1932, p. 216.

[20] K. Wyka, "Tradycje postępowe literatury polskiej," *Pamiętnik Słowiański*, III (1952), 157; J. Skórnicki, *loc. cit.*; L. Grzeniewski, "Powieść historyczna Tadeusza Łopalewskiego," *Nowa Kultura*, No. 17 (1953).

[21] C. Hernas, "Stare i nowe prace o literaturze staropolskiej po wojnie," *Pamiętnik Literacki*, XLIII (1953), 640; Wyka, "Tradycje," p. 161; W. Natanson, "Sierakowski," *Życie Literackie*, No. 34 (1955).

[22] W. Maciąg, "Legenda Kordiana," *Życie Literackie*, No. 18 (1955).

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN
KANSAS - STATE

nelled by re-evaluation of Polish national history. Such re-evaluation, it is understood, should primarily demote the *szlachta* as representatives of the Polish national spirit and substitute the people in their stead. Thus "sarmatism"[23] has been replaced by "true patriotism," as evinced, to be sure, in progressive ideas and ready cooperation with Russian freethinkers and revolutionaries.

From this it follows that it is sometimes necessary to cast progressive nobles as heroes, oppressed by their reactionary superiors, side by side with plebeian heroes oppressed by cruel exploiters. In such cases, the noble as well as the plebeian represents the progressive trends of his time.[24] The author, however, is expected to differentiate sharply between the kinds of oppression they suffer.[25]

Because Poland has always been predominantly an agricultural country—"feudal," allegedly, up to 1939—the masses must needs be represented by peasants. Hence peasants, by reason of their patriotism, longing for freedom, and hatred of landowners, have to be rated almost as high in certain periods as urban proletarians with their class consciousness, their hatred of capitalists, and their drive toward world revolution. In portraying these phenomena, writers must rely on general handbooks on Marxism and their own good judgment, since thorough Marxist elaborations of individual periods are temporarily unavailable.[26] Another embarrassing aspect of the same issue is the dearth of Polish class-conscious proletarians who could be cast as heroes in any period of Polish history before 1918, since the paramount concern of Polish workers in their respective zones of partition was the regaining of Poland's independence rather than the dictatorship of the proletariat.

There is no discussion of the craft of historical fiction as a genre in Poland today. This is unfortunate because interesting theories on the subject were advanced after World War II, stimulated particularly by the many historical novels dealing with the Piast period.[27] Some concern, however, is expressed by the critics over the artistic shortcomings

[23] This term, designating the Polish national tradition as represented by the ideals, culture, and customs of the *szlachta*, is today the favorite target of critics who insist that plebeians only are the true repositories of the Polish national spirit. See Hernas, pp. 643, 646; Maciąg, *loc. cit.*

[24] J. Putrament, the extremely influential president of the Professional Union of Polish Writers, and the spokesman of the party in matters of literature, states explicitly: "nothing is so alien to Marxism as a mechanical application of present-day criteria of evaluation to a historical era... we are heirs of everything valuable and enduring from the 400 years of existence of our literature." See his *Na literackim froncie* (Warsaw, 1953), p. 21.

[25] Preger, *loc. cit.*

[26] J. Skórnicki, "Jeszcze o kłopotach epiki historycznej," *Życie Literackie*, No. 32 (1955).

[27] Especially worth mentioning are A. Gołubiew's articles: "Budowa modelu" and *"Srebrne Orły* Parnickiego," in *Tygodnik Powszechny*, No. 13 (1950) and No. 4 (1950), respectively; E. Paukszta, "Początki Państwa Polskiego w powieści współczesnej," *Życie i Myśl*, II (May-June 1951).

of new historical novels, even of ideologically impeccable ones. In fact, ideological impeccability and artistic value seem to exist in inverse ratio. The charges most often repeated are: poor characterization, particularly of plebeian heroes;[28] careless, haphazard construction, indicating haste;[29] sameness in the choice and treatment of subject (to be sharply distinguished from correct adherence to the established design, required within a planned literature);[30] crude, monotonously repetitive didacticism, misunderstood by some authors for ideological education of the masses[31] (this is now dubbed "shovelology");[32] poor style and clumsy composition, which is the dominant weakness of literary newcomers, self-educated writers of proletarian origin. In short, under attack are all those failings which make organized production in this genre "fictional biographies" rather than historical novels.[33]

However regrettable the critics find these faults of technique, they unhesitatingly ascribe them solely to the writers' insufficient grasp of the principles of socialist realism. It is therefore natural enough that writers should turn for models, if not for inspiration, to the works of their Russian *confrères* whose mastery of the method has been recognized.

Accordingly, it is possible to notice two patterns clearly reminiscent of their Soviet counterparts, which the Polish historical novel has been emulating: (1) the re-evaluation of important moments of national history, casting the People as the hero; (2) sagas of the revolutionary proletariat and grim pictures of worker and peasant life under the Tsarist regime. Certain details in Soviet patterns had, naturally, to be readjusted to fit Polish conditions.

Mediaeval backgrounds under socialist realism present opportunities for antireligious sallies. J. Wiktor's *The Pope and the Rebel*

[28] E.g., Skórnicki, "Kłopoty"; W. Leopold, "W latach przełomu," *Nowa Kultura*, No. 44 (1954).

[29] For instance, in his introduction to M. Rusinek's *The Admiral's Spring* (1953), St. Strumph-Wojtkiewicz states: "This book should have taken several more years of work ... still, what can one do? There is so little time!" However, at the date of this writing the most recent declaration of party policy in literary matters warns against "impatience and haste for immediate results." Editorial, "Aby wzmóc udział twórców w kształtowaniu naszego życia," *Nowe Drogi*, X (Jan. 1956).

[30] E.g., Grzeniewski, "Pochwała pięknej powieści historycznej," *Nowa Kultura*, No. 32 (1954); J. Kwiatkowski, "*Dziewiąty Batalion* Brozozy," *Życie Literackie*, No. 36 (1955).

[31] K. Barnaś, "*Ród Gąsieniców* Kapeniaka," *Życie Literackie*, No. 14 (1955); Preger, *loc. cit.*; H. Markiewicz, "Opowieść o młodym Żeromskim," *Życie Literackie*, No. 35 (1954); Skórnicki, "Jeszcze."

[32] "Łopatologia." As explained in a collection of satirical fables—in itself an interesting recent phenomenon—the term is applied to an overzealous cramming of information into the readers as if with a shovel. J. Osęka, *Przełom w Bulwie* (Warsaw, 1955), p. 41.

[33] J. Skórnicki, "*Muszkieter z Itamariki*—Rusinka," *Życie Literackie*, No. 40 (1955).

(1953), portraying a crowd of callous and cynical popes, emperors, and various nobles attending the Council of Constance (1414), and T. Kwiatkowski's *Seven Virtuous Mortal Sins* (1954), a coarsely humorous picture of the life of mediaeval monks, are interesting in that they show that the dependence of Polish literature on Soviet models is far from automatic. Such "godless" propagandistic works are completely out of date in the Soviet Union today, and, even at the height of the antireligious campaign in the 1920s, scarcely any literary works were produced there to serve it; this was the domain of journalistic jokes and propaganda pamphlets. Evidently Polish writers are to cure social ailments by remedies which they consider proper in specific local conditions.

Mediaeval themes do not necessarily involve religious problems, though clergymen are always relegated to the reactionaries' camp. F. Fenikowski's *The Ring with the Swan* (1952), for example, based on the life of Jan of Kolno, a Pole who supposedly discovered America before Columbus (a faithful imitation of V. Grigor'ev's *Grigorii Shelikhov*, a Russian who first discovered the Aleutian Islands), is a novel of adventure and exploration. Several novels by K. Bunsch seem to indicate that he has adopted Kraszewski's ambitious plan to tell the whole history of Poland in fictional form. These books have simple plots based on adventures of a fictional character, a number of archaeological details necessary to make them "mediaeval," a few scenes involving a king or a famous warrior to make them "historical," and a few cases of oppression of peasants by villainous feudal lords to make them "ideologically acceptable." Being short (about 200 pages), each with a preface summarizing the historical events of the given period, numerous illustrations, and a glossary of obsolete words, they would in prewar days have made acceptable reading for juveniles. The fact that today they are discussed by reviewers in all seriousness as adult fiction is indicative, among other things, of the intellectual level of the reader for whose education the books are written.

"The goal of our contemporary historical novel," says a critic, is to portray the story of and the role played by the people's masses in different epochs of our past.[34] There having been no Razins, Pugachevs, Bulavins, or Bolotnikovs in Polish history,[35] no novels like those in Russia[36] picturing the wrath of the oppressed people are possible. Writers en-

[34] Z. Hiernowski, *Twórczość*, X (June 1954), 174.

[35] Szela's *jacquerie* in 1846 hardly qualifies, having been inspired by Austrian authorities to break up the independence movement organized by the *szlachta*.

[36] E.g., in Soviet literature: A. Chapygin, *Stepan Razin* (1927-29); S. Zlobin, *Stepan Razin* (1952); A. Veselyi, *Guliai Volga* (1934); G. Shtorm, *Provest' o Bolotnikove* (1929); D. Petrov-Biriuk, *Dikoe pole* (1946); V. Shishkov, *Pugachev* (1943-44). The Pugachev mutiny had served as background for Pushkin's novel, *Kapitanskaia dochka* (1836), and for two novels popular in their time, *Pugachevtsy* (1874) by E. Sallias de Tournemir and *Chernyi god* (1888) by G. Danilevskii.

deavoring to stress the historical role of the masses turn instead to the dramatic moments of Poland's struggle for freedom after the partitions —the uprisings of 1830, 1848, and 1863.

In spite of their importance in Polish history and their emotional appeal, the uprisings as a theme did not often attract historical novelists before World War II. Several reasons for this can be suggested, though no one of them is exhaustive: censorship difficulties before 1918; political controversies within Polish society, particularly at the turn of the century, concerning the wisdom of armed resistance and the historical role of the *szlachta*; a diminished interest in these involved problems in the period between the two world wars. To postwar writers, however, the vast canvas of the insurrections offers an opportunity for re-evaluating history from a proper point of view, and for introducing the proper hero.[37]

For a historical novel today the "proper point of view" is one portraying the class struggle in a given era,[38] and the "proper hero" is regularly of plebeian origin. Since, however, Polish history furnishes no names of outstanding peasant insurrectionists,[39] nameless "peasant masses" have to fill the stage, while heroes are either plebeian fictional characters[40] or highborn historical personages who owe their military achievements to their distrust of the reactionary *szlachta* and their reliance on the peasant masses.[41]

Side by side with these active insurrectionists, the Polish historical novel features characters, both historical and fictional, modelled on the Soviet pattern of the "precursors of the Revolution." Books following this pattern are meant to show (to quote a Soviet critic) "the growth of the revolutionary wave and the high-pitched enthusiasm of the revolutionaries of noble descent,"[42] as well as (to quote a Polish critic) "the powerful awakening of self-consciousness, the growth of a democratic undercurrent among plebeians."[43]

---

[37] Grzeniewski, "Pochwała."

[38] E.g., T. Łopalewski's novel, *Sprawiedliwi* (1952), with its emphasis on the plot and the fate of a fictional insurrectionist of 1863, was violently denounced for its author's "lack of Marxist approach to history" evinced in his "forgetting about the conflict between the nobles and the serfs." L. Grzeniewski, "Powieść historyczna T. Łopalewskiego," *Nowa Kultura*, No. 17 (1953).

[39] Bartosz Głowacki, the peasant hero of Kościuszko's insurrection in 1794, is the exception proving the rule.

[40] E.g., J. Kapeniak's *Ród Gąsieniców* (1954), a saga of a fictional mountaineer family, the climax of which is the short-lived rebellion against landlords in 1847; and the much-praised book by a self-educated writer, J. Brzoza, *Dziewiąty batalion* (1953), which tells the story of the tumultuous events of 1848-49 as seen through the eyes of a peasant soldier.

[41] E.g., Hauke-Bosak, hero of the insurrection of 1863, in J. Płażewski's *Szabla i pióro* (1952) and Józef Kozłowski, insurrection of 1830, in Z. Przemski's *Szary Jakobin* (1951).

[42] R. Messer, "Zhiznennyi podvig pisatelia," *Zvezda*, July 1953, p. 175.

[43] Preger, *loc. cit.*

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE LIBRARY APR 11 1957 MANHATTAN KANSAS

The Landless Kingdom by T. Hołuj[44] is a good example. It describes the fortunes of a simple soldier, ideologically an equal of his contemporary Russian Decembrists, who openly tells his officer, whom he knows to be one of the plotters of the future insurrection of 1830: "You do not trust us, gentlemen officers, and yet what are you without us? Nothing, just nothing!"[45] Both the soldier and the officer express and live up to lofty ideas, startlingly like those of their counterparts in Soviet novels. These counterparts even wander occasionally from the pages of Russian novels and turn up in Polish ones, delivering such significant statements as:

> Russians, ready to abolish the hated regime at home, are ready to act nobly and generously, restoring freedom to the Polish people... to try in every way to abolish the hatred existing between the two nations... The rebuilding of Poland should, however, be accomplished on such principles and conditions as would protect Russia in the future from any activity which could endanger her security and peace.[46]

Thus a Decembrist, an aide of Tsarevich Constantine, addresses a Polish patriot. And, conversely, in a Soviet novel of the same pattern, an officer from Tsar Alexander's retinue says to a Polish lady:

> Can Russia abandon Poland to an uncertain fate?... How is the necessity of state—the protection of Polish and Russian frontiers—to be made compatible with Poland's independence?... Oh, if only the two countries would understand that their welfare is solely in mutual friendship! Then the two Slav nations would stand united against the enemies of both Russia and Poland.[47]

The popularity of the Soviet novel featuring a famous historical personage—for example Alexei Tolstoy's *Peter the First*—ran high during the wartime nationalist trend but waned with the development of the postwar trend of "Soviet patriotism." In Poland, M. Rusinek's work on Krzysztof Arciszewski, a colorful soldier and seafarer of the seventeenth century,[48] reads well as an old-fashioned romance of adventure quite independently of its ideological aims. Progressive-minded, patriotic and courageous, unappreciated by a near-sighted monarch, a victim of court and army intriguers whom he despises, a friend of the humble and the oppressed, a Unitarian who opposes the established church and denounces its reactionary influence, Arciszewski shares the tribulations of Kutuzov, Bagration, Suvorov, Ushakov,[49] all of whom were once fashionable in the Soviet Union but are considerably less so nowadays.

---

[44] T. Hołuj, *Królestwo bez ziemi*, 2 vols. (Cracow, 1954).
[45] *Ibid.*, I, 145.
[46] *Ibid.*, II, 87-88.
[47] L. Nikulin, *Rossii vernye syny* (Moscow, 1950), pp. 420-421.
[48] M. Rusinek, *Wiosna admirała* (1953) and *Muszkieter z Itamariki* (1955).
[49] A. Bragin, *Predvoditel Kutuzov* (1944); S. Golubov, *Bagration* (1943); L. Rakovskii, *Generalissimus Suvorov* (1947) and *Admiral Ushakov* (1953); M. Iakhontova, *Korabli ukhodiat v more* (1947).

Soviet novels dedicated to the portrayal of a class-conscious proletariat, the driving force behind the Revolution, are direct descendants of Gorky's works. Usually based on their authors' autobiographies, they either tell a poignant story of the hero's destitute childhood, his eventual conspiratorial activities, and, later, his actual fighting for the Revolution[50]—or give a general picture of the dismal life of the Russian masses under the tsarist régime seen through the eyes of a child.[51] Sometimes, too, a member of the intelligentsia is shown breaking away from his class (bourgeois vices as well as erroneous liberal ideals) and joining the ranks of the revolutionary proletariat.[52] In Poland after 1949 several books were produced in close imitation of this pattern. They were enthusiastically greeted by literary critics as an indictment of social conditions in prewar Poland and as a picture of the Polish proletariat awakening to class consciousness. *Mother and Son* by A. Bobruk, a typical representative of the kind, deserves analysis.

Bobruk's novel is a story of a worker's large family always on the brink of starvation. It won the Polish Radio Prize in 1951, received a literary award in 1953, and at the time of this writing has had three editions. The hero (born about 1910) loses his father early, begins working in a factory, joins the Communist Party, is arrested, put in jail, and tortured. Escaping to the Soviet Union in 1939, he learns the meaning of real life and beauty while working on a collective farm; on his return to Poland after the war, he promotes collectivization in his native village, and concludes his story (told in the first person) with the puzzling statement: "Our reality is greater than the Truth of which I used to dream."[53] Several situations are taken bodily from Gorky's *Mother*, for example, Mother Bobruk's distributing illegal pamphlets after her son's arrest, in order to mislead the police, who rightly suspected him of being the chief distributor. All the classic Soviet villains are present: the rich bigoted aunt, a fat and drunken village butcher, the sadistic gendarmes and jailers.

The book, like most of the autobiographical novels coming from the pens of proletarian writers, newcomers to Polish literature, is poorly organized and badly written. It has, nevertheless, a specific value under socialist realism: "its manifestly true and deep undercurrent is the tide of History itself."[54] The presence of this "undercurrent" of the class struggle, showing how the new order, the proletariat, grows inside the

[50] E.g., N. Ostrovskii, *Kak zakalialas' stal'* (1936).

[51] E.g., F. Gladkov's trilogy: *Provest' o detstve* (1949), *Vol'nitsa* (1950), and *Likhaia godina* (1954).

[52] E.g., K. Fedin, *Prevye radosti* (1946) and *Neobyknovennoe leto* (1948).

[53] A. Bobruk, *Matka i syn* (3rd ed., Warsaw, 1953), p. 199.

[54] Thus J. Andrzejewski, in an introduction to Bobruk's book, echoes a Soviet critic's opinion on Gladkov's trilogy: "Out of this individual human existence History itself emerges." Z. Kedrina, "Zhizn' geroia i zhizn' naroda," *Literaturnaia Gazeta*, No. 43 (1954).

moribund old order, gives, it seems, this whole group of books a claim to be classed as historical fiction.[55]

In this group of novels can also be included a trilogy by a prewar writer, I. Krzywicka, *Those Bound and Those Free*.[56] It is noteworthy for its presentation of the respective roles of the progressive intelligentsia and the proletariat. It is the latter who instinctively know the road to freedom, not the intellectuals who merely learned of it from books. This attitude, incidentally, is no longer quite the fashion in Russia but may evidently still be "worn" in provincial literatures. The trilogy pictures a traditionally petit bourgeois milieu (à la Zapolska in the Polish tradition and à la Fedin in the Soviet), and a proletarian milieu à la Gorky. There is young love blossoming between a class-conscious worker and a girl from the bourgeoisie. The girl, who leaves home to live and toil among the working people, represents the new. The old is best represented by her brother, a factory owner shown collapsing in his carriage surrounded "like a slippery ice floe in a spuming flood"[57] by workers marching in a May 1st parade. The scene, according to a reviewer, "is a proper artistic conclusion drawn from a dialectical view of the course of History."[58]

Biographical novels— *vies romancées*—constitute a separate section in postwar Polish historical fiction. They are not modelled on Soviet works—in Russia *vies romancées*, popular in the 1920s, came from the pens of "fellow travelers" and "formalists"[59] before the advent of socialist realism; the few that appeared after the war are too insignificant to serve as a pattern. Thus, the *vie romancée* in response to a social command is apparently a Polish novelty. The artistic value of these works is uneven, varying with the talent of the author and, specifically, with the degree of his adherence to the task of proving a point instead of recreating the life of a great man. The writers endeavor to show these great men as appearing "always at that particular moment when the objective necessity of the People's movement makes their appearance imperatively unavoidable."[60] This didactic effort, naturally, leaves its imprint on the work.

---

[55] Thus N. Grydzewska's *Men of Coal* (1951), which describes the Polish miners' strike in France in 1936, is discussed as a "historical" novel; M. Kubicki's trilogy *Those Years* (1953) is called "an ambitious truth-saturated historical tale" of a peasant boy in the years 1908-23; and J. Koprowski's *The Tale about my Father* (1950) becomes "a *sui generis* historical novel, since this biography ends with the third decade of our century."

[56] I. Krzywicka, *Skuci i wolni*, 3 vols. (Warsaw, 1947-53); title changed in 2nd ed. in 1955 to *Rodzina Martenów*.

[57] *Ibid.*, III, p. 468.

[58] W. Maciąg, "Cykl powieściowy Krzywickiej," *Życie Literackie*, No. 6 (1954).

[59] E.g., Iu. Tynianov's excellent book on *Pushkin* (1936-37) and his studies on Küchelbecker, *Kiukhlia* (1925); and Griboedov, *Smert' Vazir Mukhtara* (1929).

[60] G. Lukács, *Der historische Roman* (Berlin, 1955), p. 341.

As a genre, *vies romancées* stem from the ambivalent desire to see a genius live through a cycle of events shared by all mortals, but at the same time lending to that cycle the romantic grandeur that derives from its being experienced by a genius. In other words, it is a way of meeting a genius on common human grounds, getting better acquainted and sharing intimate emotions. The Polish biographical novels pursue the same goal, but differ in that they assume the common ground to be class struggle. For this reason they must necessarily be products of "an imagination mastered and controlled by a stern discipline of materialistic thinking."[61] Hence, great men are invariably cast as revolutionary spirits persecuted by reactionary regimes and their adherents, and not —as romantic tradition would have it—misunderstood by the insensible mob. Chopin is introduced as "the citizen of only that Poland which struggles toward justice for the People,"[62] and the great romantic poet Słowacki is made to say: "Personally, I have no fondness for property. I never had any interest in even that part of my uncle's estate which was mine by right . . . What's more, I think that the era of private property which paralyzes and burdens us is finished."[63]

If writers are sensitive to the social command, so too, and perhaps even in a higher degree, are the critics. They remind the reader that St. Czernik's *Story of Klemens Janicki* (1954), a sixteenth-century poet, portrays the hero's "peasant origin and the manifestations of social injustice connected with it."[64] They draw attention to the hatred allegedly felt toward capitalism by the small holders among the *szlachta*, as shown in M. Jastrun's *Mickiewicz* (1949). The same critics stress Mickiewicz's faith in the brotherhood of *all* Slavs, his peasant-like piety opposed to the official piety of the Church, his conviction that a Poland divided into social classes is a transient condition.[65]

And yet, Jastrun's book, undoubtedly the best of the group, seems to convey a rather different message to the reader. True, Jastrun's approach is unorthodox; it depends on a different characterization and interpretation not so much of Mickiewicz himself as of his surroundings, of contemporary historical events, social conditions, people with whom he lived or came in contact. Some scenes and speeches are so startling as to require the source of the author's information in footnotes. But the book is a portrait of a poet drawn by a poet with dignity and understanding. The author tries to present a recognized national bard not as a

[61] J. Ziomek, "Jastruna rzecz o Kochanowskim," *Nowa Kultura*, No. 50 (1954).

[62] J. Broszkiewicz, *Opowieść o Chopinie* (Lodz, 1950), p. 120; an earlier *vie romancée* of Chopin by the same author, *Kształt miłości* (1949), is of incomparably higher artistic value.

[63] M. Jastrun, *Spotkanie z Salomeą*, 3rd ed. (Warsaw, 1953), p. 139.

[64] S. Podhorska-Okołow, "*Opowieść o Klemensie Janickim*—Czernika," *Nowa Kultura*, No. 13 (1955).

[65] Z. Dąbkowska, "*Mickiewicz* Mieczysława Jastruna," *Odrodzenie*, No. 30 (1949).

statue on a pedestal but as a great man striving towards the loftiest ideals, and sinning against them; yielding to conventional temptations, yet struggling with fate and history through a lifetime, wounded at every step.

The construction of biographical novels presents an interesting variety of methods. Naturally, contemporary documents of all kinds, like memoirs, diaries, letters, as well as anecdotes and reports of conversations, hold the first place in importance. In some cases, for example, St. Dobrowolski's work on Jakub Jasiński (1951), a hero in Kościuszko's insurrection, a mosaic of authentic texts is cemented by a stylized narrative. This device is reminiscent of that used by Berent in his trilogy *The Undercurrent* (*Nurt*), "the most refined book in all the literary production of the years 1934-35."[66] Whenever the life portrayed is that of a writer, much of his story is told through the medium of his works. Thus Jastrun in his *Mickiewicz* employs Maurois' technique in using these "documents of emotion" to interpret the poet's acts and read his thoughts. The technique requires great skill, failing which the story may get out of hand, as A. Sowiński's *School Years* (1954) proves—whole pages of Żeromski's autobiographical novel, *The Labors of Sysiphus,* are inserted without quotation marks.

When documents on a hero himself are few but primary and secondary sources on his era are plentiful, when a hero's works and his biography have been studied, discussed, and annotated by numerous scholars, then a book becomes possible which is "neither a monograph nor a biographical novel, but a fantasy based on scholarly principles," and the author "exercises his right to creative invention."[67] Such are Czernik's book on Janicki, in which the final scene shows the dying poet's kaleidoscopic vision of his whole life (suggestive of the final scene in Strachey's *Queen Victoria*), Jastrun's version of Słowacki's last meeting with his mother, and particularly his book on the greatest poet of the golden age of Poland, Jan Kochanowski (1954). This "scholarly" method allows the introduction of minor fictional characters and characters fictional in all but their names,[68] as well as characters created out of a few lines of verse:

> "Her face is like snow, her hair like gold, her eyes are stars." Thus appears to us the first Unknown Lady in the life of the Poet... It is useless to look for any trace of her in official documents, chronicles or entries. She passed by without leaving any imprint of her little shoes, most probably sewn with golden thread ... Lidia...[69]

---

[66] C. Backvis, "Les Tendances de la littérature polonaise," *Le Monde Slave,* Jan. 1935, p. 127.

[67] M. Jastrun, *Poeta i dworzanin* (Warsaw, 1954), p. 475.

[68] For an interesting discussion of Sienkiewicz's use of this technique see J. Kijas, "Źródła historyczne *Pana Wołodyjowskiego*," *Pamiętnik Literacki,* XLIII (1953), 1137-1156.

[69] Jastrun, *Poeta,* p. 35.

On the other hand, a historical personage may owe his appearance in the novel to the fact that he was the first Pole to read Engels![70]

All these fictionalized biographies of poets, artists, military leaders,[71] etc., are not, of course, a matter of coincidence. They constitute what a critic has called the "worthwhile" series of the State Publishing Institute.[72] Social command, educational aims, possibly the certainty of a favorable publishers' market,[73] all play their part. The centennial of Mickiewicz's death, for example, brought out several attempts to portray one or another aspect or period of his life.[74] It would, nevertheless, be a mistake to dismiss the factor of genuine, deep-rooted, even nostalgic, love of the great national heritage of Poland's past. And the many newly published scholarly studies and documents serve as an additional incentive.

Generally, the situation in Polish literature is serious. Even assuming that the difficulties of subject matter and creative methods of a Polish literature designed to educate the masses in the spirit of socialism can be solved satisfactorily—who are the educators and who the educated? In prewar Poland readers were recruited mostly from the intelligentsia; there was also a considerable body of readers from the semi-intelligentsia interested primarily in light fiction. Historical fiction between the wars was, with very few exceptions, produced by highly erudite, often sophisticated writers, most of whom today apparently cannot or will not follow the dictates of socialist realism. The majority of new writers fresh from the ranks of the proletariat do not as yet possess the necessary cultural equipment. Publishers seem to be well aware of these difficulties, and critics and reviewers are tireless in giving advice to both writers and publishers but somehow with scant results. It is doubtful whether the semiliterate peasant and proletarian readers for whose education today's literature is primarily intended are best served by propagandist fiction of inferior quality. One is rather inclined to agree with Gorky and Maiakovsky who, when faced with the same problem, insisted that the masses should be given first-rate literary fare, and trusted to appreciate it and even to discover Marxist values in it:

> shed—and fast, too—your haughty complacency:
> masses are no worse than you at making things out!

---

[70] Jastrun, *Spotkanie*, p. 8.

[71] E.g., St. Strumph-Wojtkiewicz's series on insurrectionist generals of 1863: *Generał Komuny* (Wróblewski) (1950), *Opowieść o Bronisławie Szwarcem, Sierakowski* (1954).

[72] J. Skórnicki, "*Opowieść o Klemensie Janickim*—Czernika," *Życie Literackie*, No. 45 (1954).

[73] E.g., a certain publishing house, planning its schedule of publications, drew up a list of branches of industry that were best fitted for fictional treatment. D. Bieńkowska, "Szczerze o tematyce współczesnej w prozie," *Życie Literackie*, No. 3 (1954).

[74] E.g., G. Bojanowski, *Rękopis dla wnuków* (1955); T. Łopalewski, *Namiestnik Narodu* (1955); A. Świderska, *Adam* (1955).

AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN
KANSAS

Of late, changes in political climate have brought heated discussion and open criticism.[75] At the Polish Writers' Congress in 1954, Antoni Słonimski, the well-known prewar writer, stated bluntly: "Some have said [here] that the situation is tragic, others that things are not so bad really. Nobody has said that things are going well, not even the officials from the Ministry of Culture and Art."[76] At the most recent Congress, in March 1956, Jan Kott, a literary critic of repute, admitted that the year 1949 started the decline of Polish literature and ideology, without, however, fatally impairing their vitality.[77] Leon Kruczkowski, an author of renown and the long-time administrative head of Polish culture, expressed anxiety over the low level of criticism as well as over erroneous ideas about its freedom. A more Leninist approach is necessary, he declared, and writers have a right to protest, if unjustly attacked.[78]

Many Westerners, hopefully watching these harbingers of artistic spring, seem to forget that "criticism and self-criticism" is not a dagger pointed at the heart of socialist realism, but an officially recognized weapon in its own arsenal. Those within the sphere of influence of socialist realism probably remember this, and, for such as may have temporarily forgotten, statements by responsible party spokesmen may serve as a timely reminder:

> The fulfillment of the resolutions of the IIIrd Plenary Session is obstructed not only by those who suppress criticism and obstinately cling to dogmas, but in no lesser degree by those who interpret creative freedom as freedom to advocate ideas alien and hostile to us, thus trying to weaken the ties between the Party and the men of science and culture.[79]

In a recent article Jerzy Putrament, a staunch champion of socialist realism, blames the admitted shortcomings of Polish literature on "a mechanical transplantation to the Polish ground of Soviet models from a completely different era," that of the early 1930s when Stalin stood godfather to socialist realism, newly created to help him suppress demogogic faultfinding with Soviet reality.[80] The accusation is unjust because it was precisely in the years following World War II that Soviet reality was most thickly "varnished" and any criticism of its darker sides most rigorously banned. Indeed, Polish literature since 1949 has been freely adopting the latest Soviet models—including that of "the thaw" which today makes statements like that of Putrament possible.

---

[75] For a discussion of the so-called "thaw" in Polish literature, see K. A. Jeleński, "Po trzęsieniu ziemi," *Kultura*, No. 5 (103) (May 1956); C. Miłosz, "Poland: Voices of Disillusion," *Problems of Communism*, No. 3 (May-June 1956).

[76] *Nowa Kultura*, No. 25 (1954).

[77] J. Kott, "Mitologia i prawda," *Przegląd Kulturalny*, No. 14 (Apr. 1956).

[78] L. Kruczkowski, "Uwagi o wolności i autorytecie krytyki," *Nowa Kultura*, No. 1 (1956).

[79] Editorial, *Nowe Drogi*, X, No. 1 (1956), 7.

[80] J. Putrament, "Straszak naturalizmu," *Przeglad Kulturalny*, No. 27 (July 1956).

And this is exactly why the situation in Polish literature is serious. It is more serious than in Russia, because there literature has at least the advantage of being original. Socialist realism was made in Russia for a purpose—Soviet works of fiction are like so many bricks turned out to serve as material for "building socialism." In Poland, the tenets of socialist realism are imported somewhat like the pieces of prefabricated houses, and the efforts of Polish writers to put them together are often clumsy and not always successful. There is an old Russian proverb: "What is healthy for a Russian may cause a foreigner's death." Socialist realism may well prove fatal to Polish fiction.

University of Wisconsin

THOMAS WOLFE AND ANATOLE FRANCE: A STUDY OF SOME UNPUBLISHED EXPERIMENTS

DANIEL L. DELAKAS

IT WOULD be hard to imagine two twentieth-century authors cast in more different molds than Thomas Wolfe and Anatole France; yet it is a fact that Wolfe admired Anatole France and, early in his career, even adopted his manner in two unpublished satires.[1] Moreover, in Wolfe's mature works there are faint echoes of the French novelist. The style of France is so different from that of Wolfe that the connection might never be suspected save for conclusive manuscript proof in the Wolfe Collection in the Houghton Library, upon which I have drawn for a substantial portion of this article.[2]

On October 24, 1924 Wolfe left America for the first time. In the four years before this trip he had obtained his master's degree from Harvard, had his plays rejected by the Theater Guild, and taught for two semesters as an English instructor at New York University. He went to Europe because he hoped to be able to live more cheaply while he gave himself a chance to do nothing but write. After he had considered and rejected England and Germany, France seemed the place where inspiration awaited him;[3] something of what the French capital

[1] There is no mention of Wolfe's literary connections with Anatole France in any of the following works: Terry's edition of Wolfe's *Letters to His Mother*; "Writing is My Life," *Atlantic Monthly*, Dec. 1946 through Feb. 1947; the Edward Aswell "Note on Thomas Wolfe" in *The Hills Beyond*; Muller's *Thomas Wolfe*; Pollock and Cargill's *Thomas Wolfe at Washington Square*; Richard Walser's *The Enigma of Thomas Wolfe*; Louis D. Rubin's *Thomas Wolfe, The Weather of His Youth*; or Kennedy's article, "Thomas Wolfe at Harvard, 1920-1923," in the *Harvard Library Bulletin*. Reeves' University of Paris dissertation, *Thomas Wolfe et l'Europe* (1955), does not describe the role of Anatole France. Van Wyck Brooks came closest to seeing the symptoms of a common humanistic tradition in the two writers, yet he placed Anatole France in the midst of that humanism which he claims American writers of the 1920s ignored (see *The Confident Years*, New York, 1952, Chap. XXX). Wolfe's collected correspondence and his authorized biography were still in the process of being prepared for publication by Elizabeth Nowell Perkins and could not be consulted before this article was completed.

[2] For my use of Wolfe's manuscripts, a debt of gratitude must be acknowledged. Without the generous and courteous assistance of the Houghton Library staff and without the most sympathetic and understanding permission of Edward Aswell, literary executor of the Wolfe estate, and of Charles Jackson of the Widener Library to publish this manuscript material, this study could not have been made. Permission to quote any of the manuscript material used in this article must be obtained from Mr. Aswell and from Mr. Jackson. Grateful acknowledgment must also be made to Northwestern University for the grant of a faculty fellowship which enabled me to use materials at Harvard University.

[3] For other evidence of Wolfe's hopes and aspirations for his first year in Europe and for his reactions while there, see *Letters to His Mother*, from May

meant for him in his middle twenties is conveyed by the passages in his diary written a few days after he arrived.

Monday, Dec. 8th [1924]

Someone has advised young men to see Paris before they reach the age of twenty-five. I am therefore in good season; and everything that has been said or written about Paris is true [Wolfe, as he writes this, is just two months and five days past his twenty-fourth birthday].

It is evil, it is beautiful, it is fascinating, it is bewildering. For the first time in several years, I am faced with an utter suspension of all my faculties. I speak French only a little—and very badly. I read it slowly—a terrible devastating impotence has possessed me these past two days—life is passing me by which I am unable to grasp but superficially. I am in possession of a beautiful fruit which I am unable to taste.

Two days later his spirits had begun to soar.

In two days, however, a certain confidence has come to me in speaking the language. The words I have read, I hear spoken on the street and though [end of fragment].[4]

The full force of France and of French civilization was soon to be felt, all the while the French people and "race" increasingly antagonized him. The rest of December Wolfe spent rewriting a lost play. Then followed a month of dissipation, then two months of intermittent travel through the western provinces; and in March he settled briefly in Tours to begin his experiments in prose fiction. He continued these tentative first efforts for nearly two months at St. Raphaël in the Midi, and, after traveling in late May and all of June through northern Italy and Switzerland, spent July and August in England hard at work. "Passage to England" (most of which was written in France) was to lead within a year to the first draft of *Look Homeward, Angel*.[5]

This vehicle for Wolfe's initial experiments in prose fiction was a kind of a literary journal. As each installment was completed (between mid-March and mid-September 1925), Wolfe mailed it to his former preparatory-school teacher, Mrs. Roberts. The "Passage" remains to this day unpublished and incomplete, only part of it typed, most of it still in the sprawling Wolfean hand. It consists of some 5,000 pages, divided into twelve installments, each installment supposedly marking

1923 through Aug. 1925. Wolfe's later description of this period is in *The Story of a Novel*, pp. 28, 29, and 68. For an extended study of the importance of Wolfe's European trips, see Delakas, *T. Wolfe, la France et les romanciers français* (Paris, 1950), Chap. I, and a recapitulation of much of the same material in G. M. Reeves, *Thomas Wolfe et l'Europe* (Paris, 1955), Chap. II.

[4] Houghton Library, the William B. Wisdom Collection of manuscripts, accession number (hereafter referred to in the text and the notes as "H. L.") *46 AM —7 (23), Part 1 of two parts.

[5] See Wolfe's letter from Avignon to Mrs. Roberts of Mar. 21, 1925, in "Writing is My Life," *Atlantic Monthly*, Dec. 1946, p. 65, and his letter to his mother of Apr. 14, 1925.

a day's entry in the journal of an imaginary voyage from New York to England between October 24 and November 4, 1924.

The "voyage" was imaginary in a double sense. The first installment includes a prefatory page and then a lengthy "Fantastic Prologue" which introduces the narrator. He is, like Wolfe, a sincere young man with a Mencken-like combativeness. The "Prologue" provides a paradoxical framework for the whole journal by having its narrator miss his transatlantic steamer and yet experience all the discomforts and all the pleasures of a sea voyage while remaining in his New York hotel room. Another young man comes to visit him and, once the bizarre nature of the voyage has been discussed, they spend the rest of the "Prologue" talking about literature.

Each subsequent installment of the "Passage" follows a kind of formula. First the diarist describes the leave-takers, then some of the passengers aboard ship, and records their conversations. In each day's entry, some point in the conversation strikes a tender nerve in the narrator's fundamental views. He soon erupts in a passionate tirade dozens of pages in length giving his rebuttal to the point of disagreement or irritation. An early digression of this sort (No. 2) takes up his views on the Jews; another (No. 3) is heavily ironic at the expense of nationalists who call themselves "internationalists." Again, a shipboard conversation on the dreadful social consequences of being excessively tall (always a sore point with Wolfe) finally digresses into a complete short story—different in setting and in characters from anything else in the manuscript.

The whole "Passage" is quite naive both in manner and in method. Probably its most striking literary feature is its failure to follow a consistent method or to achieve any kind of homogeneity. The very free "form" of the diary, in fact, could almost be described as a "passage through styles." Surprisingly enough, very few examples, if any, can be found of what is now called Wolfe's dithyrambic prose, those long lyric passages invoking litanies of geographic names or repeated paraphrases of the same idea in patterns of Shakespearean iambic pentameter. The "Passage" is almost an exercise in un-style. Its manner is no manner at all. In it the reader is most conscious of a discipline only in the direct discourse and in the conversations of people Wolfe represented as stupid. Here we find early specimens of his imitations of various dialects, chiefly New York Jewish, cockney, and Bostonian. Then, when the passionate digressions begin, the discipline relaxes, sentences lengthen, parentheses appear, and clause is added to clause. But the digressions are very different from those of the later novels. Except for two or three short stories, they are always in one of two forms—the highly discursive essay or the philosophical essay in the form of extended dialogue.

As much as we should like to see Wolfe's explosive essays as early exercises in his later manner, they seem rather to be a kind of uninhibited natural expression of his powerful creative drives. There is evidence that he was, at first, deliberately setting out just to let himself go, and *not* to develop a consistent style, or to find a manner suitable to his talents. Of course, he was soon to be seeking to achieve a personal style; but the truth is that, at this moment in his development, he wanted to "escape the yardstick." Thus we have the hotel-room narrator in the "Fantastic Prologue" explaining his position to his visitor by an attack upon the conventional labels and clichés of literary history.

> Oh, damn your yardsticks! There has come down to most of us nothing but a continuous and interminable sum of addition which we ultimately solve by rejecting as false. Our critics in literature and art serve mainly to feed the type of mind which mumbles formulas about the "18th Century," the "Restoration," the "Renaissance." Only the other day, I was reading a criticism by Emile Faguet in which he asserts gleefully that Rostand is really a French romanticist of the period of 1630 and he adds that the younger generation of poets and dramatists who have rejected the work of the only writer "capable of giving France an epic" are imbeciles.
>
> If the younger generation of writing people have rejected Rostand because he is "a romanticist of the period of 1630," they certainly are imbeciles. We may as well assert that the poets and dramatists of 1630 are romanticists of the early 19th century in the manner of Rostand and reject them on that account: the formula has quite as much meaning when read from either end.[6]

Continuing, the narrator attacks "the education of a very advanced young man of our time" (his hotel-room visitor seems to be one of the sort) because such a young man has rejected the Victorians for the French symbolists. The burden of his complaint is against literary vogues, and he attacks several present-day "fads" which he had observed at Harvard—the "preoccupation with homosexuality" and "incest of the *Oedipus Rex* type." Neo-Humanism itself, he declares, is a kind of fad, and he insists that Babbitt is as wrong as the French when he claims that the Greeks were controlled or restrained writers:

> Not long ago I listened to a series of lectures on the French neo-classicists by a professor at Harvard University [obviously Babbitt], a very brilliant, very learned man, with a caustic and enlivening tongue, whose saturation in the classical tradition has succeeded in rendering him subject to that particularly virulent form of insanity which takes as its first hypothesis the beginning of earth's decay during the life of Jean Jacques Rousseau and since, its gradual deliquescence, now almost complete.[7]

As a matter of fact, there is a corresponding "madness that the Greeks alone were capable of." The "restraint" of the Greeks, he declares, is a modern French myth which is denied by the record:

---

[6] H.L. *46 AM—7 (23), Part 1 of two parts, p. 24. The first installment was typed out by Mrs. Roberts. All the rest are in Wolfe's hand. The page numbers used are those found in Mrs. Robert's typescript.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

1957 KANSAS

We are harnessed to our formulas. We are, perhaps, the victims of the French who attain a great reputation for sagacity and rational clearness by their ability to give a name [to all] things. With them, creation is forever attended by a comic but bitter warfare between their "ancients" and their "moderns," their "classicists" and their "romanticists," their "symbolists," their "surrealists," their "unanimists."

The answer, according to my friend [Kenneth Raisbeck] whose activity so much resembles that of the Chambered Nautilus may be in unanimism... I shall never forget the day when he arrived at the conclusion that Cabell was "greater than Anatole France." Having passed Jean Cocteau and Paul Morand, he is being faithful in his fashion to James Joyce [this is the earliest reference to James Joyce in Wolfe's writings] and T. S. Eliot. And, I might add, he could do a great deal worse.[8]

If the reader of "Passage to England" is beginning to wonder by this time what approach to literature the hotel-room narrator is willing to accept as valid, beyond a kind of defense of unrestraint, his answer is to be found in the extended image of "a city which continues to be itself" —something like Paris where the whole literary past in all its richness enjoys a kind of perpetual present:

Let us think of such a city, Paris, if you will—in which, mingled without premeditation or without a sense of strangeness, the courtiers of Louis XIV shall pass and repass among the ladies and gentlemen of the First and Second Empires, where Quentin Durward and the Scotch mercenaries may file past a brisk new company of the Class of 1918; where Malesherbes and Voltaire, and Balzac and Ernest Renan might meet, curse or discourse; where a great scientist, a great painter, a great poet, might look from windows at all the little clowns who have [exposed (?)] or defiled him. These might wrangle with one another but not with ghosts.[9]

Once the "yardstick" was escaped, and the literary faddist was put to rout, the writer could freely find his place in the "city which continues to be itself"—and ultimately, of course, among those who spoke his own language. In miscellaneous papers sent with the "Passage" to Mrs. Roberts is this revealing literary confession, probably written about this same time:

Manifestly, the whole course and purport of my intent is to achieve in English prose a personal and distinct style. If I am to write at all, it is to be in the language of the tongue I speak, and not in Chinese, Italian or Greek. It is far more to the point, therefore, that I imitate—aye, in the straightly literary sense—the prose of Thomas de Quincey than the prose of Cicero, Renan or Thucydides.[10]

This, then, was Thomas Wolfe in a transitional period. A fairly clear outline now emerges of what sort of man he was when he took his first steps along the road which was to lead finally to *Look Homeward, Angel.* While Babbitt had aroused a violent reaction in Wolfe, the Harvard professor also had taught Wolfe a great deal; for the diarist

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[10] H.L. *46 AM— 7 (23), Part 2 of two parts; unnumbered MS. leaves.

had to become conscious of classification into literary "schools" before he rejected it. The undeniable evidence in the "Passage" of an acquaintance with and an interest in French literature will come as a surprise to those used to seeing Wolfe as exclusively concerned with English and American traditions. It is true that, except for passing the foreign-language reading requirement for his Harvard M.A., Wolfe never took any course in French literature except the one with Babbitt on "Neo-Classic Criticism" (and then only as an "auditor"). Yet the above quotations find Wolfe ranging through two centuries of French literature from Malesherbes through Voltaire, Rousseau, Balzac, and Renan to Baudelaire, Rimbaud, Verlaine (these last three are not in the quoted passages but are discussed in the "Prologue's" section on the symbolists, p. 25), Rostand, Anatole France, Brieux, Cocteau, and Morand. The most surprising fact is Wolfe's awareness, at least, of contemporary French writers—most of whom were slighted by Babbitt.[11]

It is the *whole* tradition of French literature which Wolfe intends to view as simultaneously contemporary, not ranged in historical order as "classicists" ... "romanticists" ... "symbolists" ... "surrealists" ... "unanimists." What is the meaning of his modern literary cosmopolis? In its contemporaneousness, it provides a wealth of prose models for the writer to use in achieving his own "personal and distinct style." Wolfe's confession, quoted above, shows him beginning to search for such a style. Would it be going too far to suggest that the rejection of foreign models was still halfhearted on the part of a young writer who at this very stage hoped to submerge himself in the stimulating milieu of a foreign culture? Later evidence will point to this as being true, at least as far as Anatole France is concerned.

France's death took place in Tours the same month that Wolfe left New York on his first trip to Europe. Eighty years old at the time of his death, the Frenchman was a literary force with a reputation acknowledged throughout the Western world and in Russia. Certainly France's name would have been often spoken at Harvard. The diarist of "Passage to England" is not wholly awed by France's reputation. In the "Fantastic Prologue" Wolfe takes him to task for his internationalism and for a piece of wartime propaganda he had written. On the other hand, we find him deploring the faddish young man's abandonment of France for Cabell.

As a representative critical opinion on Anatole France, and one which Wolfe certainly read and may have accepted, we may quote from the work by Faguet which Wolfe refers to in the "Fantastic Prologue."

[11] Wolfe's notes on Babbitt's lectures fill two 8 x 10 notebooks (H.L. *46 AM —8, Part 3 of three parts). Babbitt did talk about Anatole France to his classes, for we find that Wolfe's notes on his lecture of Dec. 16, 1922 record a discussion of the French writer as a critic: "Anatole France says there are no literary standards and cites Viaud, who, he says, was an ass. But nobody reads Viaud."

Summarizing his discussion of the French writer, Faguet wrote as follows:

> Le fond de M. Anatole France, comme celui de Voltaire, est l'horreur des religions, que ce soit la chrétienne ou que ce soit le fanatisme révolutionnaire, étant donné qu'il ne veut jamais voir et qu'il ne voit que les maux qu'elles ont faits et non jamais le bien qu'elles ont produit. Il est quelque chose comme Voltaire non corrigé par Auguste Comte... Il est admirable écrivain français et je veux dire sobre, net, d'un tour élégant et antipathique à la métaphore. Les meilleurs écrivains sont souvent ceux qui ne sont pas de leurs temps. M. Anatole France est un écrivain du XVIII[e] siècle avant Rousseau.[12]

To this, if we are to understand Wolfe's hidden admiration for Anatole France, we need to add those aspects of the novelist which derive from his love of the Renaissance: his search for a humanism without prejudice, his display of erudition, and his "reincarnation" of Rabelais and Villon. It may be too that the young Wolfe was struck by the fact that France's novels sometimes attempt to reflect so much that they seem like mystifications, pastiches, or even antiquarian sketches. Yet the Frenchman's achievement must have seemed impressive—in his character portraits as well as in his caricatures, in his magnificent effects through dialogue, and in his honest record of the contradictions he found in personalities, human behavior, and philosophies.

The extent to which France may have figured in Wolfe's thoughts at this period is suggested by a passage in *Of Time and the River*, written perhaps ten years after the event and removed from the novel by the editors before it was sent to press. It was probably intended to form a part of Wolfe's discussion of French writers in Chapter LXXV:

> Anatole France had just died and they spoke of him with surprising bitterness and hatred: he [Eugene Gant] was confused and bewildered by this malice and wondered from what source it had come. Almost the day after France's death [France died on October 12, 1924; actually Wolfe arrived in Paris on December 6] there appeared in the book windows of Paris several essays and estimates of his work, written by many Frenchmen. He now bought several of them and read them. Most of them were scurrilous and abusive. The dead man was jeered and called foul names, and after 100 pages of this sort of "criticism" there was a final summary in which he was called a third-rate essayist, a charlatan, and a thief. He grew a little sick as he read these words—in the cheap-paper, the hasty, uncorrected printing and the bad words.[13]

Even if we allow for the fact that ten years may have elapsed between the event and the report, this excerpt gives us a suggestive picture of Wolfe's probable sympathy for France in the period when he was writing "Passage to England."

The impact of Anatole France on Wolfe's writing in this formative

---

[12] Emile Faguet, *Petite Histoire de la littérature française* (Paris-London, 1916?), pp. 306-307. Wolfe's copy.

[13] H.L. *46 AM—7 (46), Part 3 of three parts; rejected portions of *Of Time and the River*.

period is evident in two documents which he sent to Mrs. Roberts with the installment of "Passage to England." They are "The Dean of Saint Rupert's Satire" and the "Isle of Quisay." Both sketches have a "religious" cast and treat their subject matter in the style of Anatole France. Neither is incorporated in the journal of the sea voyage. As with the short story of the excessively tall young man, noted above, Wolfe must have planned to integrate these two sketches into the journal, probably in the seventh installment, the entry for Sunday, November 2. Perhaps the reason he never incorporated them into the journal manuscript was that he never completed either sketch.

The "Dean of Saint Rupert's" consists of a series of dialogues between a young man and an elderly Anglican clergyman—an "innocent seeker after knowledge" and a "disenchanted philosopher."[14] The dean does most of the talking. The young man asks a "topic question" now and then and expresses astonishment, dismay, or agreement appropriate to his innocence or to his knowledge. The topics are, to say the least, extremely miscellaneous. They discuss *war* ("caused by old men because they are jealous of the young men of the world"), *civilization* ("Just as the Jews have a unique communication with God, which other nations do not have, and enjoy His especial patronage, so have the French a unique communication with Civilization: they reverence it, they protect it, they save it from vandalism"), *religion* (the dean mocks the Tennesseans for their Scopes trial), *water* (it is criminal to use it for drinking or for bathing; wine or beer suffice for the first, the second is not necessary), and finally, *salamanders*. On the last topic which fills four manuscript pages, the dean talks not about a species of lizard but about the vision of naked women seen in flames above open fires. He cites, as his source, experiments by the necromancer recorded in Anatole France's *La Rôtisserie de la Reine Pédauque*, where M. d'Asterac, "an old alchemist," pursues "a female salamander."

In form and in characterization, the "Dean of Saint Rupert's" as a whole reflects a close acquaintance with *La Reine Pédauque*. The Abbé Coignard in the latter work, at once erudite and lewd, religious and inebriate, teacher and whoremonger, is a figure not easy to forget or to imitate. In contrast with this Rabelaisian pedagogue, his acolyte, the "innocent young student," Jacobus Tournebroche, has an almost vaporous quality. Wolfe's dean is clearly an imitation of Coignard; his young student has even less character than Tournebroche. Wolfe's sketch has a further importance, since it adumbrates the Rabelaisian episode of the two ill-sorted French priests in Marseilles in *Of Time and the River* (Chapter C).

For the other sketch with which we are concerned, "The Isle of

[14] H.L. *46 AM—7 (23), Part 1 of two parts.

Quisay,"[15] Wolfe drew again on *La Reine Pédauque*. Richard S. Kennedy has suggested in his unpublished dissertation that Wolfe's source here was *L'Ile des Pingouins*.[16] He is right, as far as he goes; but Kennedy fails to note how other works of Anatole France influenced Wolfe in this second sketch—the collection of critical essays, *La Vie littéraire*, as well as *La Reine Pédauque*. (Kennedy fails also to note Wolfe's indebtedness to Cabell's *Jurgen*.)

Wolfe probably wrote "The Isle of Quisay," a little nine-page piece, in April or May 1925, while living in St. Raphaël; at least it seems to have been that visit to the Côte d'Azur which inspired the geographical setting for the sketch. "The Isle" has never been published; because of its interest it is printed here in its entirety:

Not many months ago, upon the little island of Quisay, which is situated in the Mediterranean at a day's journey from Nice and at a distance of eighty miles from the western coast of Corsica; a place, too, rich in the picturesque customs and traditions of a simple and beautiful people, almost unspoiled by any contact with the swift tourist pack which courses along the Riviera into Italy, I had repeated illustration of the beneficent influence of a patron saint upon a devout population.

The saint, the blessed Ferdinando, passed the last twenty years of his earthly existence on the island. I could tell you of many other remarkable things about the Island of Quisay; of its lovely women, whose speech is a song for sirens, and who carry honey in their tongues, with no foul sting behind it, who are full of seductive tenderness, and whose hair is of a coppery red, so that in one of the island's glorious nights, the moon-bright hair of these women is full of little winking flames, and I could say other things concerning the eyes of these red-haired women; their color is often the blue of a deep still lake; if they touch you with even so much as the tip of their little finger, a train of fire leaps through the rivers [of] your blood; and I could speak of the beauty of their old men, whose eyes are very grey.

But chiefly might I tell you of the great antiquities of the place, and of the divine patronage that has blessed it since the advent of the blessed Ferdinando.

Upon the day of his landing in the country, the moon rose in the South-West, divided itself into two crescent halves, one of which shone on the right side of his face while the other sank below his left elbow. All of the reptiles in the land were summoned from their holes where they engaged in a fatal combat with the bull-frogs and were vanquished and driven into the sea to drown. It is further related that the demon Asmodeus, who, in an earlier time, had been discomfited going to bed, who had possessed nineteen of the fairest virgins on the island and in fits of jealous rage had strangled each of their husbands on their bridal nights, was exorcised and banished by the Saint, who sprinkled him with holy water and molten sulphur at his approach.

---

[15] The skeptical tone of the sketch is indicated by the title, which is an Anglicized version of the French "Qui sait?"; cf. Montaigne's "Que scay-je?"

[16] See his unpublished Harvard dissertation (1953), "A Critical Biography of Thomas Wolfe to his Thirty-Fourth Year," I, 192: "Other fragments show work on... 'The Isle of Quisney' [sic], a satiric imitation of *Penguin Island*..." Except for a very few minor errors in detail, Kennedy's work cannot be too highly praised and is the most thorough, the most authoritative, and the most original study of Wolfe in existence. Unfortunately, only one chapter of this dissertation is in print, that cited in note 1 above.

It is also told that Saint Mary Magdalen came to this country and spent forty years in penitence and prayer. Age did not wither her nor time decay. She was never known to partake of food and drink save on occasions when she administered the Communion to herself and received the Viaticum. Twice a year she went up into an exceeding high mountain, cast herself upon her knees and submitted to the castigations of a flight of demons; they were winged like bats, scaled like fish, beaked like vultures and one leg was a claw, the other a hoof. Their lewd thin tongues floated from their mouths like red wefts.

The cathedral was singularly favored with holy relics: under the altar there was enshrined the fore-finger of Saint Thomas the Doubter, still slightly hooked; in the sacristy were kept the elbow of Saint Sebastian, three hairs from the bosom of Saint Bartholomew and the right thumb nail of Saint Catherine of Siena.

But we who are determined to remain loyal to the religion of our fathers must increasingly be wary of the arguments of these people. The devil, as is well known to any experienced demonologist, has power to assume many deceptive shapes. Hamlet knew this so well that he was at first committed to the impiety of doubting his father's ghost. And yet, why should we condemn the young man for this perfectly natural suspicion? Who can declare with assurance today that the ghost of Hamlet's father was not the devil? Will you answer that, please?

Satanic conversions are innumerable. The fiend appeared first to Faust as a little black dog, who followed the learned doctor on his promenade with apparent innocence, weaving all the time circles of damnable sorcery about his steps. The shapes in which he appeared to Saint Anthony (the Copt) are manifold. The vulgar are familiar only with his embodiment as a young nude woman, but he came also as the Queen of Sheba, with four thousand Negro boys in retinue and a caravan of gift-laden camels. Later, he impersonated learned doctors of all the sects.

The Reverend Cotton Mather has recorded the appearance of the demon in his "Marginalia"—he often entered into the bodies of small children, and certain old crones of the Massachusetts settlement are known to have partaken of his spirit and to have communicated his powers. Before the coming of the Saint, the people were afflicted by many devils, of whom Asmodeus, to whom I have already referred was only one (and by no means the most important or the most powerful). The population sickened and died in great hordes under the devastating persecutions of these demons: small tender children even were seized and inhabited by as many as seven or eight of the smaller-sized fiends.

The Saint immediately saw that a notable and extensive work of casting out was before him: within a year he had laid about so vigorously that all the devils had been driven from the bodies of the faithful into the sea.

Ferdinando's methods were simple and devout: when it became known that anyone was possessed, the Saint rushed immediately to the dwelling place of the victim and belabored him sturdily with a large bludgeon until he (or she) might cry out that the evil ones had fled from him (or her); several of the flock were so unfortunate as not to survive their physician's treatment; in these circumstances Ferdinando was forced to admit sorrowfully that Satan had been too strong for him.

I need hardly say that since that time the people of Quisay have been spared the persecutions of demons: they have died, indeed, from small pox, pneumonia, typhoid, yellow fever, gout, clap and syphilis and from all forms of pestilence, but from the maladies of the Fiend they have been safe.

Among the people of Quisay, a man is distinguished because of his age. The wisdom of the elders is held in the greatest veneration; children who scoff at their parents, or at their grandparents, or who are disobedient, impertinent, untruthful, idle, or in any way disrespectful are [end of fragment].[17]

[17] H.L. *46 AM—7 (23), Part 2 of two parts; miscellaneous papers.

STATE AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE LIBRARY APR 11 1957 MANHATTAN KANSAS

The Quisay sketch will repay careful analysis, for it reveals several stylistic forces struggling for dominance in young Wolfe's work. Moreover, it is an attempt by Wolfe to work in a narrative form not employed in his printed works other than in *The Hills Beyond*. He is attempting here a fable, a pure creation of fantasy in which he embodies his attributes, ideas, and beliefs in 1924-25. In the "Dean of Saint Rupert's," Wolfe's autobiographical manner is foreshadowed in the personage of the "innocent young man." In the "Isle" Wolfe himself is almost completely removed from the story, and characters he has never actually seen or met are brought onto the literary stage. The story's "objectivity" is close to France's *L'Ile des Pingouins* and *La Reine Pédauque*.

To appreciate Anatole France's full contribution to "Quisay," we have to recall his St. Maël, the leading figure in the mythical sequence at the beginning of *L'Ile des Pingouins*. In that novel, pious old St. Maël is seen spending the last decades of his life going from island to island converting and baptizing the inhabitants and eventually engaging in a contest for his soul with the Devil. The general parallel of the "Isle of Quisay" is striking. The aged missionary, the landing on the island, the miraculous and farcical involvements with animals, the irony at the expense of religion and religious practices—all recall *L'Ile des Pingouins*. The personality of Wolfe's St. Ferdinando also owes much to St. Maël: the unquestioning simplicity of the faith of the two saints, their agonizing lack of intellectual acuteness, their steady pursuit of their missionary functions. Both writers use their saints to express the "horreur des religions" which Faguet found in Anatole France.

In "Quisay" Wolfe dwells on Ferdinando's outlandish, unbelievable, and brutal acts. He does not attempt to testify against the historical validity of the relics in the cathedral, but rather to arouse laughter at the expense of religion and create doubt by the very triviality and oddity of the enshrined objects. Anatole France has the same kind of fun with Brother Ange in Chapter V of *La Reine Pédauque*, particularly in the section where Coignard mocks Brother Ange's relics—"a foot of St. Eustache," "a rib of St. Mary the Egyptian," etc. On that same page we find another of the saints Wolfe mentions in his paragraph on relics. Coignard says (p. 29): "The 'Life of St. Eustache' is a tissue of ridiculous fables; the same is the case of that of St. Catherine, who has never existed except in the imagination of some wicked Byzantine monk."[18]

Accompanying the skepticism of the "Quisay" sketch is an interest in the satanic; Wolfe dwells on the Devil's "power to assume many

[18] Anatole France, *The Queen Pédauque*, tr. Joseph A. V. Stritzko (New York, 1923). James Branch Cabell wrote the Introduction. I quote France from the versions that were in Wolfe's personal library.

deceptive shapes," and Satan and his minions occupy a good deal of the writer's attention. Anatole France's writings, along with Shakespeare, Goethe's *Faust*, and Cotton Mather, are among the sources which nourished this aspect of Wolfe's creative expression in both the "Dean" and the "Quisay" sketches.

For France's contributions of details to Wolfe's demons we must look elsewhere than in *L'Ile des Pingouins*, since Satan as an active character more or less disappears from the book after the mythical episode with St. Maël. Wolfe's St. Ferdinando has considerably more vigor and vitality than the half-blind, half-deaf, and senile St. Maël, and much less tolerance. His belaboring of the Devil's victims with a club is more reminiscent of the virility of the Abbé Coignard in *La Reine Pédauque*. The Rabelaisian tone of the "Isle of Quisay" is, in fact, sometimes very close to *Pédauque*. In this work, France almost gives Wolfe the words which he uses in "Quisay," when he has Brother Ange fearfully exclaim (Chapter V, pp. 35, 37):

> I myself have seen, at a place called St. Claude, at a cottager's, a Salamander in a fireplace close to a kettle. She had a cat's head, a toad's body and the tail of a fish ... And do not forget that the Salamander is naught but the devil, who assumes, as everyone knows, the most divergent forms, pleasant now and then when he succeeds in disguising his natural ugliness, hideous sometimes when he shows his true constitution.

Wolfe also speaks of our familiarity with the Devil's "embodiment as a young, nude woman" (for which we might read "salamander," of such importance in *Pédauque*?) and of the flock of gargoyle-ugly demons who attacked Mary Magdalen on her mountain top twice a year (certainly a parallel dwelling on the Devil's "natural ugliness, hideous sometimes").

Still another example of borrowing from Anatole France can be found in Wolfe's use of the Tobias-Asmodeus legend in his "Quisay" sketch.[19] While it is true that, throughout his childhood, Wolfe had heard the stories of the Old Testament and later read them, in this skeptical period he was not prone to use the Bible as a source for his "models." It seems likely that he drew upon the Hebrew legend of Asmodeus in Anatole France's *La Vie littéraire*. Wolfe's underlinings and marginalia, found throughout his copy of D. B. Stuart's translation, *On Life and Letters, 3rd Series*, is sufficient evidence that he read the essays attentively.

The Tobias-Asmodeus legend appears in the eighteenth essay of

[19] Asmodeus is first alluded to in Gen., VI, 2, but the legend we are concerned with here is recounted in the Book of Tobit. Since this is a part of the Old Testament Apocrypha excluded from the Authorized Version, it is not likely that Wolfe heard it read at home. The demon also appears in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, IV, 168-171, without the details given in the Anatole France version; he reappears in Lesage's *Diable boîteux*, a work which is not in Wolfe's library.

the France collection, "M. Bouchor and the Story of Tobias [L'Histoire de Tobie]." The essay is a dramatic review, not of a play with living actors, but of a marionette performance of a Biblical legend rendered into verse by Maurice Bouchor. The review is devoted for the most part to recounting the original third-century B.C. Jewish legend upon which Bouchor based his five tableaux. In telling the story, Anatole France makes the jealous and murderous Asmodeus the primary antagonist to the successful marriage of Sarah, the daughter of Raguel. Sarah (*Of Life and Letters, 3rd Series*, pp. 215-216), "although seven times married, was still a virgin, and feared to remain so forever, for the demon Asmodeus, who loved her, would not suffer that she should be possessed by a man. He strangled her husbands when they came near her. He had already killed seven."

This is the legend used by Wolfe in paragraphs 4 and 9 of his "Quisay" sketch. In both the France and Wolfe accounts this demon is exorcised by noxious fumes. Wolfe, however, chose to reverse France's hierarchy of demons, which involved eleven others less important and less powerful than Asmodeus.

It seems appropriate to say something of the influence on this experiment in fantasy by still another writer, James Branch Cabell. His contribution is perhaps felt, rather than seen. But it is not unexpected. Cabell's *Jurgen*[20] had been a scandal in 1919, and H. L. Mencken had led the list of those who rallied to its author's defense when the book was attacked and brought to court by the censors. Wolfe was unquestionably interested in the *cause célèbre*, especially because of Mencken's part in it. One of the reasons for the 1919 effort at censorship had been the scene on the Isle of Cocaigne, where Jurgen's marriage to Queen Anaïtis takes place.

If we compare this scene with Wolfe's second paragraph in "Quisay," we can feel the sensuous influence. Cocaigne, appropriately for the "moon-myth" queen, is an island of eternal night; Wolfe's women of Quisay "in one of the island's glorious nights" have "moon-bright hair." The maidens of Cocaigne astonish Jurgen not so much by bathing him but by their caresses (Chapter 22, p. 152) "with the tongue, the hair, the finger-nails and the tips of their breasts"; on the Isle of Quisay, the "tip of their little finger" evokes an astonishing "river of fire" in the blood. Cabell's girls carry honey to Jurgen in a bowl; Wolfe's have it on their tongues. During the ceremony on Cocaigne, Jurgen's bride is adorned with a headpiece described by Cabell as "a network of red coral with branches radiating downwards" (p. 154); Wolfe's girls on Quisay have hair that is "coppery red." There is hardly a woman whom Jurgen meets who does not seduce him or *vice versa*; we find the

[20] James Branch Cabell, *Jurgen, A Comedy of Justice* (New York, 1919).

women of Quisay are nearly as "seductive." In Cabell's novel, also, we find a skeptical interest in demonology which very probably derives in part from Anatole France, since the French novelist was Cabell's acknowledged master. We may reasonably view the recurrent refrain of religious skepticism in the Quisay sketch as probably derivative from Anatole France, but supplemented with the Cabellian nuances of erotic stimulation and the playful mixture of sex and fantasy. Wolfe evidently intended in his "Isle of Quisay" to blend strains not only of *L'Ile des Pingouins* and *Pédauque* but also of the Isle of Cocaigne.

Our analysis would leave a false impression if it attributed only two literary strains—the Francean and the Cabellian—to the sketch. There is another strain which we may associate with the later Wolfe. In the "Quisay" satire we find signs of an intransigent and indomitable individual who already has begun to transcend both his sources. He places events in the present century ("not many months ago"), instead of in the Middle Ages as in the Penguin Island fable and in *Jurgen*, or in the eighteenth century as in *Pédauque*. The personal stamp of the later Wolfe is on this work: the autobiographical touch at the beginning (Wolfe had spent two months in the spring of 1925 on the Côte d'Azur); his hearty open sensuality—a brand of "carnal mysticism" distinct from the sniggering of Cabell and the urbane frankness of the French novelist; and, finally, the reference to the Anglo-American literary traditions—Hamlet and Cotton Mather. The bludgeoning manner of the descriptions of miracles, relics, and exorcisms perhaps aims at the same ends as the doubt sowed by France and Cabell; yet the very heaviness of the style, the almost puritanical savagery, and the bitter mockery in "Quisay" associate it consciously or unconsciously with the English satiric tradition of Pope and Swift, rather than with the deft, cultivated, modulated, and keenly intellectual tradition of France and his American imitators. The heavy, sarcastic note is one which will become more dominant in Wolfe's satirical style as he becomes more self-consciously an American novelist.

Wolfe's admiration for Anatole France was probably most strongly felt in the period of the "Quisay" sketch. The French novelist seems to have been important to him in two ways: first, as a writer of admired novels, as a thinker and a stylist; and, second, as one of the most distinguished representatives of the national tradition which emphasized clarity, precision, and form. In his journal of November 1928, he was to write:

> Germans are not good story tellers... Best story tellers are probably the French—after them, the English. The character of the French language lends itself to the telling of a story. It is clear, distinct and rapid. Cleanness and simplicity of structure are qualities that have been emphasized by the French. Renan said that he was grateful for the narrow confinement of the French language, since it

had disciplined him and forced him to win whatever success he had won within its comparatively narrow limits.[21]

As Wolfe gained more experience in prose fiction, he must have had to face the fact that the basic nature of his creative character would never let him achieve in English prose those "delicate subtleties" of which Anatole France was master, or to produce the kind of fiction which was distinguished for lucidity and control. Nevertheless, he continued to admire stylists like Cabell, Hergesheimer, and Scott Fitzgerald, who were closer to the manner of Anatole France than he was, and he was always ready, as his notebooks show, to rally to the defense of the French novelist when attacked by unfeeling or "faddish" critics. During the ten years following "Passage to England," Wolfe returned six times to Europe and wrote two successful novels and a book of short stories in the dithyrambic style with the accent often on the harsh, even hideous aspects of reality which we associate with his mature works. Yet, as his writing began to enjoy some success and as he came into more direct contact with the prejudices of readers and critics, he seems to have felt, if anything, more sympathy with the French novelist, even though his own practice was leading him further and further afield.

Evidence of a decade of interest in and approval of Anatole France can be found in Wolfe's thirty-two notebooks written in the eleven years following his first trip to Europe.[22] The 3,200 pages of these notebooks reveal a subdued but continual concern for Anatole France. There are over a dozen references in the notebooks to France himself, and at least as many to his works. A few of these references are purely neutral, as when on his fourth trip to Europe, Wolfe names France as one of the authors whose works he saw on Thursday, November 15, 1928, at a book sale in Budapest. But others show the manner and the degree to which France figured positively in his thinking. In Budapest again, he made a list entitled "A Library for a Young Man of Today."

[21] H.L. *46 AM—7 (69); notebook 5.

[22] Much has been said about Wolfe's writing his novels in bookkeepers' ledgers. Actually, like every legend, this one is only partially true. For the greater part of his career, he used several kinds of writing materials—among them thirty-two pocket notebooks. Except for Kennedy, who mentions them briefly in his unpublished dissertation, no one has ever studied their contents. Before writing "Passage to England" and in the fall of 1924, Wolfe made a practice of putting down firsthand experiences in 8 x 10 notebooks. Later, in 1925, in others of the same size, he rewrote, added to, and rearranged this first record of experiences to fit into the diary form of "Passage." This revision is what he sent in installments to Mrs. Roberts. Starting in 1926, however, during his second trip to Europe, Wolfe began to keep notebooks of a more convenient, portable size. Most of these notebooks are approximately 3½ x 6½ inches in size and, although there are some gaps, they provide an intimate record of Wolfe's travels for the period of 1926-38, his thoughts and impressions, his museum and book-store browsings, his plans both for himself and for his novels, lists of places he had been, miles he had traveled, books read or to be read, and, finally, his personal correspondence (he often wrote first drafts of letters in the notebooks).

He recommended thirty books as being the great, seminal books of all time—starting with Plato's *Phaedo* and ending with Georg Kaiser's *Oktobertag*, and including "*Penguin Island*—A. France." Among the "Mock Literary Anecdotes" which Wolfe dated as of "December 2, 1924" in his selections from these small notebooks in *Of Time and the River* (Chapter LXXV)—really written between February and March 1929, not in Paris but in New York—it is not surprising to find an anecdote built around Anatole France and Rodin, or to find France discussed and imitated as a literary critic (pp. 664, 677). In an entry in his tenth notebook, in May 1929, he lists under the heading "Books which have good titles" *Penguin Island* and *The Gods Are Athirst*; he was searching for a title for his "O, Lost!" manuscript after it had been accepted for publication. On p. 78 of his twelfth notebook (late summer 1929 through January 1930), he makes this oblique defense of the French novelist:

> We have come perhaps to mistrust nobility. They [the writers critics approve of] are noble and we are embarrassed they are noble—and the result of their nobility is that Anatole France is "a dirty old man" and that a S. M. Hutchinson has written a truly great, a truly inspiring play. They are noble and behind their noble mask is the rock, the rope and the screw.

This is just one entry in the notebook record of Wolfe's war with the critics who so aroused his anger and caused him so much personal pain in the 1930s. Just as he stubbornly defended Tennyson in the 1920s when that writer, whom he highly respected, had fallen from the critics' esteem, so we find him in the 1930s resenting the fall of Anatole France into disfavor.

In "O, Lost!" (1926-28), the original manuscript out of which *Look Homeward, Angel* was extracted, there are unmistakable signs of a return to the irony and skepticism of *L'Ile des Pingouins*. In an unpublished section, there is a southerner named Judge Webster Sondley. For years, the judge has been at work on an "epic history of demonology," not merely narrative but philosophical in method. With his habitual love for the litany of names, Wolfe lists the judge's library of books on the subject (the idea of a library on demonology recalls the Abbé Coignard's discovery in *La Reine Pédauque* of M. d'Asterac's books and manuscripts on the same subject). Among titles by such French writers as André Gide, Camille Flammarion, and Stéphane Mallarmé, there appears "*L'Ile des Pingouins* by Anatole France." The inclusion of the France novel is more than casual. On the following page of the manuscript, the judge's very irreverent illustrations for his *magnum opus* are described. They include a series of pictures of God which illustrate the simplest, most infantile ideas of the divinity up through "others that become almost geometric illustrations of a proposition in metaphysics." One of them shows a sinner, kneeling before a

LIBRARY APR 11 1957 MANHATTAN KANSAS

bearded deity and seeking forgiveness. In the explanation below the picture, God speaks as follows:

> If you do not confess to me what I already know, I shall condemn you in the First Place, since I am Absolute Love, to my avenging wrath; in the Second Place, since I am Life and inhabit the Universe and am in all of you, to my enemy, who, being evil, has no existence, but is nevertheless against me and inhabits part of you; in the Third Place, to the Evil of My Creation which, since I am the cause and fulfillment of Absolute Good, could never have existed in the First Place. Since it was predestined before your birth that of your own Free Will, you should commit a non-existent sin of which you are incapable, I shall mete out to you the punishment that I planned for you before you had voluntarily succumbed to the undemonstrable Evil which in my all seeing ignorance, I forced you to succumb to without letting myself be conscious of it.

Most of these paradoxes, together with their irony, are probably derived from Chapters VI and VII of Book I of *Penguin Island*, where France intends to expose the cruelty of religious concepts and the inherent contradictions of doctrinal Christianity. Presented with the dilemma of an island of accidentally baptized penguins, the Deity receives the following counsel from St. Augustine: "If, Lord, in your wisdom, you pour an immortal soul into them, they will burn eternally in Hell by virtue of your adorable decrees. Thus will the transcendent order, that this old Welshman [St. Maël] has disturbed, be re-established." This advice, however, the Lord felt, lacked mercy:

"And, although in my essence, I am immutable, the longer I endure, the more I incline to mildness." Finally the problem was solved by His decision to change the penguins into men, in spite of the following disadvantages:

> Many of those men will commit sins they would not have committed as penguins. Truly their fate through this change will be far less enviable than if they had been without this baptism and incorporation into the family of Abraham. But my foreknowledge must not encroach upon their free will.
>
> In order not to impair human liberty, I will be ignorant of what I know. I will thicken upon my eyes the veils I have pierced and in my blind clearsightedness I will let myself be surprised by what I have foreseen.

The unpublished sketches, "Dean of Saint Rupert's" and "Isle of Quisay," as well as the Judge Sondley episode from "O Lost!," reveal early attempts by Wolfe to imitate the prose of Anatole France. As he plunged into the difficult craft of novel writing, the American writer obviously sought prose models, much as he had been teaching his New York University students to seek them. In a great many respects, Anatole France must have seemed the most finished craftsman of the day and therefore a logical object of emulation for Wolfe at the beginning of his European experiences. In this Wolfe would have had the tacit support of Mencken and his followers, as well as the whole "school of Cabell," who felt that the only choice which an American could make was to seek suitable models abroad.

Wolfe's efforts to write in a "cosmopolitan manner" were short-lived. In the end he seems to have abandoned all idea of emulating France's works. His successful practice in prose fiction led him further in the opposite direction—toward the exploitation of the "barbaric yawp." His rejection of "the classical, simple, god-like manner of Anatole France" (*Of Time and the River*, p. 664) was not entirely one of volition; it was also due to incapacity. But his notebooks do show that up to the very end of his life he was haunted by the memory of a writer who has been only very distantly associated with his works.

Ripon College

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN
KANSAS

SIDNEY'S IDEA OF THE "RIGHT POET"

A. C. HAMILTON

THOUGH Sidney's *Apology for Poetry* was the critical manifesto for poets and critics in the Elizabethan age, its subsequent history is unfortunate. Its influence does not extend beyond the seventeenth century—Swift remarks that Sidney wrote "as if he really believed himself"—and later, mainly through Shelley's ecstatic quarrying, it was reduced to a noble though extravagant panegyric upon poetry. After Spingarn revealed its sources in Renaissance Italian criticism, it was seen as a gracious restatement of the thoughts of others, "what oft was thought, but ne'er so well express'd." C. M. Dowlin has made the only attempt to rehabilitate Sidney as a thinker.[1] He showed that the sources usually cited for Sidney's doctrine that imitation alone constitutes poetry are not valid; but then he found its probable source in Robortello.

Originality of ideas is difficult to claim for any Renaissance writer, especially one as eclectic as Sidney; and perhaps all Renaissance critics, including Sidney, wrote only footnotes to the works of Plato, Aristotle, and Horace. We must recognize, however, that a critic may gather earlier criticism into a synthesis which is original. In this essay I wish to analyze the idea of the "right Poet" which forms the argument of Sidney's *Apology*, in order to show that it is original with him and not merely taken from the sixteenth-century Italian critics. The sources of this idea have been found by J. E. Spingarn and others mainly in Scaliger's *Poetice*. To point out this source, however, only raises the problem of how Sidney uses Scaliger; for what he takes from others he makes his own. His critical doctrines are related to their sources in the same manner as *Othello* is related to Cinthio's *Hecatommithi*—with both, the sources have been so transmuted that differences become more significant than any similarities. In general, whatever Sidney finds in earlier criticism he gathers into a higher synthesis. In his *Apology* he integrates the major tradition of literary criticism that derives from Plato, Aristotle, and Horace, and it is this conflation which yields its profound and original argument.

Sidney's argument arises from a division of poets into "three seuerall kindes": The first "imitate the inconceiuable excellencies of GOD.

[1] "Sidney and Other Men's Thought," *RES*, XX (1944), 257-271. In his *English Literary Criticism: The Renascence* (London, 1947), J. W. H. Atkins claims that what gives to Sidney's work its undoubted value is "its originality, the skill with which Sidney has drawn on earlier teaching, selecting, adapting and fusing together ideas gathered from many sources, in order to set forth ultimately his own conception of poetry, independently arrived at" (p. 137).

Such were *Dauid* in his Psalmes, *Solomon* in his song of Songs... *Orpheus, Amphion,* [and] *Homer* in his hymnes." The second deal with philosophical matters: "eyther morrall, as *Tirteus, Phocilides,* and *Cato*; or naturall, as *Lucretius* and *Virgils Georgicks*; or Astronomicall, as *Manilius* and *Pontanus*; or historical, as *Lucan.*" The third he calls "indeed right Poets."[2]

According to Spingarn, the source of this division is Scaliger, who writes of the three kinds of poets:

> Primum est Theologorum: Cuiusmodi Orpheus & Amphion: quorum opera tam diuina fuerit, vt brutis rebus etiam mentem addidisse credantur. Secundum genus Philosophorum: idque duplex, Naturale, quale Empedocles, Nicander, Aratus, Lucretius: Morale secundum suas partes, vt Politicum ab Solone & Tyrteo. Oeconomicum ab Hesiodo: Commune a Phocyllide, Theognide, Pythagora. Tertio loco ponentur ii, de quibus omnibus mox.[3]

Yet this division according to the poet's subject is only one of three which Scaliger makes, the others being in terms of inspiration and age. Moreover, it is made only for the sake of argument, for Scaliger believes there are as many kinds as there are subjects: "horum tot sunt genera, quot res ipsae, de quibus suo loco. Artis tamen gratia ad summa tria fastigia reducantur."[4] What he offers, then, is merely a convenient classification of poets.

Sidney, on the other hand, makes an absolute distinction of kinds. Those of the first kind are not really poets: "the first and most noble sorte, may iustly bee termed *Vates*"; of the second kind, he remarks: "whether they properly be Poets or no let Gramarians dispute"; and only the third kind are "indeed right Poets."[5] He goes on to distinguish the three kinds according to the nature of their imitation, their purpose, and the end of their poetry, nothing of which is suggested by Scaliger's division. Scaliger uses Plato's notion of inspiration to classify poets into two kinds: those who are born divinely inspired and those who seek divine inspiration through wine;[6] this division, it may be noted, corresponds in no way to that made according to subject. In contrast, Sidney's threefold division clearly distinguishes the nature of poetical inspiration. The first kind of poet is divinely inspired, and "against these none will speake that hath the holie Ghost in due holy reuerence," while the second kind cannot be inspired because he is "wrapped within the folde of the proposed subiect, and takes not the course of his

---

[2] "An Apology for Poetry," in *Elizabethan Critical Essays,* ed. G. Gregory Smith (Oxford, 1904), I, 158, 159. All quotations from the *Apology* are from Vol. I of Smith's edition.

[3] *Poetices Libri Septem,* 3rd ed. (1586), I, ii (p. 11). See Spingarn, *Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (New York, 1899), p. 270; also Smith, I, 387.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Smith, p. 159.

[6] *Poetice,* I, ii (p. 10).

owne inuention." Only the right poet is properly inspired—not in the Platonic sense of inspiration as that suppression of intellect by which he is akin to the lunatic, but in the Christian sense of "breathing into" by which he is "lifted vp with the vigor of his owne inuention."[7] Thus Sidney is led to reject Plato's view of poetry as a "very inspiring of a diuine force, farre aboue mans wit," for he believes that the poet ranges "within the Zodiack of his owne wit."[8] Sidney may have been well aware of how he radically transformed the threefold division of the poets which he found in the *Poetice*. Scaliger classifies the poets so that he may claim Lucan as a poet because he wrote verse; but Sidney adds Lucan to the second kind, those who are not poets, and goes on to say "it is not riming and versing that maketh a Poet."[9]

We may understand Sidney's threefold division of the poets, and see how he uses Scaliger, by relating the *Apology* to the source of the critical tradition in Plato. Though the *Apology* was occasioned by Gosson's *Abuse*, Sidney finds his natural adversary in Plato. He uses the brilliant strategy of allowing Plato's attack upon poetry to be directed against the first two kinds of poets, and then formulates a third kind which Plato could not recognize. In this way, he may absorb Plato—"whom the wiser a man is the more iust cause he shall find to haue in admiration"[10]—while going beyond him.

The first kind, the divine poet, is denounced by Plato for telling false things about the gods, though if he praises the gods he may be admitted into the perfect commonwealth.[11] Sidney allows only that the divine poet may cheer the merry and console the troubled; and, though he honors this "most noble sorte," he does not defend him.

The second kind, the poet who takes his material from philosophical or historical matters, is attacked by Plato on the grounds that such poetry is thrice removed from reality, being produced at second hand without knowledge of the subject. Sidney allows Plato's argument when he says that such poets "retaine themselues within their subiect, and receiue, as it were, their beeing from it," being simply "takers of others." As Plato compares poets to the painter whose work is a copy

[7] Smith, pp. 158-159, 156. Chapman, in the "Epistle Dedicatory" to his *Odysseys*, similarly distinguishes the two kinds of poetic ecstasy: "There being in *Poesie* a twofold rapture, (or alienation of soule, as the abouesaid Teacher [Ficino] terms it) one *Insania*, a disease of the mind, and a meere madnesse, by which the infected is thrust beneath all the degrees of humanitie: *& ex homine, Brutum quodammodo redditur*... the other is, *Diuinus furor*; by which the sound and diuinely healthfull, *supra hominis naturam erigitur, & in Deum transit.* One a perfection directly infused from God: the other an infection, obliquely and degenerately proceeding from man." *The Poems of George Chapman*, ed. P. B. Bartlett (New York, 1941), p. 408.

[8] Smith, pp. 192, 156.

[9] *Poetice*, I, ii (p. 12); Smith, p. 160.

[10] Smith, p. 192.

[11] *Rep.*, II, 377; X, 605.

of a copy, Sidney compares them to "the meaner sort of Painters who counterfet onely such faces as are sette before them."[12] Plato banishes these poets; Sidney queries their right even to the name of poet.

But Sidney allows, as Plato does not, a third kind of poet who "bringeth his own stuffe, and . . . maketh matter for a conceite," for "all onely proceedeth from their wit, being indeede makers of themselues."[13] This kind is not like Plato's meaner sort of painter, but like the more excellent who, "hauing no law but wit, bestow[s] that in cullours vpon you which is fittest for the eye to see."[14] While the first two kinds take their matter at second hand from nature, the right poet is set "beyond and ouer all the workes of that second nature" so that he "bringeth things forth far surpassing her dooings."[15] Plato's chief charge that the poet offers an imitation of nature which may be mistaken for fact applies only to the former, for the latter offers his imitation as fiction. Moreover, the work of the right poet may not properly be regarded as an imitation "of" anything, but only as an imitation. Thus Sidney speaks of "that imitation, whereof Poetry is."[16] The right poet imitates, then, not by copying nature but by creating another nature, and as a maker may be compared to the heavenly Maker.

In Plato, such a comparison explains the creative role only of the first two kinds of poets. As the Demiurge shapes the world out of pre-existing matter according to the Ideas independent of him, so the poet must struggle with intractable matter, and, lacking its Idea, must either yield himself in admiration (as the first kind of poet) or succumb to his material and render it sweetly (as the second kind). In Sidney, the comparison illuminates the truly creative power of the right poet, for God creates *ex nihilo* and contains the Ideas within Himself. Hence Sidney may speak of the right poet who "borrow[s] nothing of what is, hath been, or shall be," but "maketh matter" and "with the force of a diuine breath . . . bringeth things forth."[17] While Plato must deny the poet any perception of Ideas, Sidney places these within the poet. "That the Poet hath that *Idea* is manifest," he writes, "by deliuering them forth in such excellencie as hee hath imagined them."[18] By reformulating Scaliger's threefold division of poets, then, Sidney was able to accept Plato's view of poetry and also go beyond it by seeing the right poet as a maker.

---

[12] *Rep.*, X, 599; Smith, pp. 180, 193, 159.
[13] Smith, pp. 180, 193.
[14] Smith, p. 159.
[15] Smith, p. 157.
[16] Smith, p. 173.
[17] Smith, pp. 159, 180, 157. See Milton C. Nahm, *The Artist as Creator* (Baltimore, 1956), especially pp. 63 ff. where he discusses the analogy of the artist to God.
[18] Smith, p. 157.

STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN
KANSAS

The background to Sidney's view of nature is given by the Neoplatonic tradition, which places reality in a supersensuous world behind and above empirical fact. According to this tradition, the artist does not imitate external nature but rather its reality, which he perceives in his own mind. While the Aristotelian tradition, by placing reality within and through nature, required the artist to imitate the phenomenal world, Neoplatonism led artists to scorn fidelity to fact. Panofsky, who has traced the influence of this tradition among Renaissance artists, writes:

> Auf der einen Seite drückt sich das Ungenügen an der bloßen "Wirklichkeit" nunmehr in einer der vergangenen Epoche fremden verächtlichen Geringschätzung derselben aus ("Ich lache über die, die jegliches Natürliche für gut achten" heißt es z. B. bei einem dieser Autoren); es wird von "Irrtümern" der Natur gesprochen, die "richtigzustellen" sind (wie bescheiden drückt sich dagegen noch der um 1550—und in Venedig!—schreibende Dolce aus, bei dem es heißt: "Es muß der Maler bestrebt sein, nicht bloß die Natur nachzuahmen, sondern dieselbe auch teilweise zu übertreffen—ich sage teilweise, denn im übrigen ist es ja schon ein Wunder, wenn es gelingt, sie auch nur annäherungsweise nachzuahmen."[19]

Sidney was heir to this tradition in its Christianized form. Since nature is fallen, to imitate nature only confines man in the fallen world. For this reason, Sidney rejects the arts and sciences which depend upon nature, such as the historian who brings "images of true matters," and the moral philosopher who urges us to "followe Nature." By affirming the knowledge of good and evil, such sciences only confirm man in his fallen state. The right poet alone is free from bondage to nature; not "beeing captiued to the trueth of a foolish world,"[20] he may render that golden world whose "reality" is contained within his own mind.

The source of Sidney's view of the poet who creates another nature is generally taken to be Scaliger, who writes:

> At poeta & naturam alteram, & fortunas plures etiam: ac demum sese isthoc ipso perinde ac Deum alterum efficit. Nam quae omnium opifex condidit, eorum reliquae scientiae tanquam actores sunt: Poetica verò quum & speciosius quae sunt, & quae non sunt, eorum speciem ponit: videtur sanè res ipsas, non vt alié, quasi Histrio, narrare, sed velut alter deus condere: vnde cum eo commune nomen ipsi non à consensu hominum, sed à naturae prouidentia inditum videatur.[21]

Sidney's indebtedness is shown in the passage where he declares that, while the other arts become "Actors and Players, as it were, of what Nature will haue set foorth," the poet "dooth growe in effect another nature, in making things either better then Nature bringeth forth, or, quite a newe, formes such as neuer were in Nature . . . so as hee goeth

[19] E. Panofsky, *Idea, ein Beitrag zur Begriffsgeschichte der Älteren Kunsttheorie* (Leipzig, 1924), pp. 44-45.
[20] Smith, pp. 167, 156, 170.
[21] *Poetice*, I, i (p. 6). See Spingarn, p. 273; also Smith, I, 386.

hand in hand with Nature, not inclosed within the narrow warrant of her guifts, but freely ranging onely within the Zodiack of his owne wit."[22]

Verbal similarities are so striking, especially in the use of the word "Actors," that Myrick concludes: "The ideas are Scaliger's. The illustrations and the emphasis are wholly Sidney's."[23] But, in fact, Scaliger serves Sidney no more than as a point of departure. Scaliger's whole point is that the poet creates things so handsomely that he seems like God; but Sidney emphasizes the poet's absolute freedom from fallen nature, and goes on to say that the poets "borrow *nothing* of what is, hath been, or shall be: but range . . . into the diuine consideration of what may be, and should be."[24] There is, literally, a world of difference between the two conceptions. In Sidney's terms, the poet who gives the appearance of things that are, even though he may include things that are not, is still subject to fallen nature. Nothing that Scaliger says suggests Sidney's claim that the poet treats only what "should be," and that, while nature's world "is brasen, the Poets only deliuer a golden."[25]

That Scaliger was not aware of the critical potentialities of his view that the poet creates another nature is evident when he considers the poet's purpose. He denies that imitation is the poet's end: "non est poetices finis, imitatio: sec doctrina iucunda, qua mores animorum deducantur ad rectam rationem: vt ex iis consequatur homo perfectam actionem, quae nominatur Beatitudo."[26] Bernard Weinberg has demonstrated that the major Italian critics do not achieve a poetic system in the Aristotelian sense precisely because they fail to see that the poet's whole end is imitation.[27] But Sidney sees that imitation alone constitutes poetry, and so is able to apply Aristotle's critical doctrine to the work of the right poet. He declares that the poet's art of imitation is the art of feigning: "it is that fayning notable images of vertues, vices, or what els, with that delightful teaching, which must be the right describing note to know a Poet by."[28] Aristotle defines the poet by virtue

---

[22] Smith, pp. 155, 156.

[23] K. O. Myrick, *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), p. 123. The force of this claim is somewhat blunted by M. T. Herrick, "The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555," *Illinois Stud. Lang. & Lit.*, XXXII, No. 1 (Urbana, 1946). Herrick demonstrates how the major sixteenth-century Italian critics are indebted to earlier critics, and of this passage writes: "this pompous pronouncement except in its extreme glorification of the poet, contains nothing that the Horatian commentators before Scaliger had not deduced from Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Horace" (p. 33).

[24] Smith, p. 159 (my italics).

[25] Smith, p. 156.

[26] *Poetice*, VI, ii (p. 900).

[27] See his "Robortello on the *Poetics*," in *Critics and Criticism*, ed. R. S. Crane (Chicago, 1952), pp. 319-348; "Castelvetro's Theory of Poetics," *ibid.*, pp. 349-371; "Scaliger versus Aristotle on Poetics," *MP*, XXXIX (1942), 337-360.

[28] Smith, p. 160. Scaliger, however, denies that the poet may be defined by his use of fiction: "non à fictione ac mendacio: non enim mentitur poesis" (*Poetice*, VII, ii (p. 902).

of the imitative element in his work, and what he means by plot or fable Sidney comprehends in his term "fiction." The poet's entire purpose is to create his fiction; he does "meerely [that is, entirely] make to imitate."[29]

Sidney clearly distinguishes the poet's purpose from the end of his poetry, while the sixteenth-century Italian critics, using Horace, always confuse the two. Thus Scaliger writes that the end of poetry is imitation, but maintains that its further end is to teach: "Finem, id est, Imitationem, siue vlteriorem finem, doctionem." Elsewhere he allows that the imitation of which poetry consists is only intermediate to the end of delightful teaching: "quamobrem tota in imitatione sita fuit. Hic enim finis est medius ad illum vltimum, quiest docendi cum delectatione."[30] Sidney's divine poet teaches delight, and the philosophical poet delightfully teaches; but neither end, nor both together, adequately describes the work of the right poet. Because Sidney understands that the poet's entire purpose is to feign his golden world of images, he goes beyond the Horatian account of the end of poetry and emphasizes wholly its rhetorical end of "moving." This end is included, of course, by the Italian critics, and Scaliger speaks of poetry "docendi & mouendi, & delectandi."[31] But no critic, so far as I am aware, anticipates Sidney's vigorous emphasis upon the end of moving. Since "the Poet, with that same hand of delight, doth draw the mind more effectually then any other Arte dooth," Sidney concludes that, "as vertue is the most excellent resting place for all worldlie learning to make his end of, so Poetrie, beeing the most familiar to teach it, and most princelie to moue towards it, in the most excellent work is the most excellent workman."[32] He holds that "mouing is of a higher degree then teaching,"[33] and his defense of poetry rests upon its power over all other arts to move men to virtuous action.

Sidney's view of the end of poetry is determined by the doctrine of the Fall. The firm Christian basis of his poetic theory is revealed when he discusses the creative power of the poet who "bringeth things forth far surpassing her [Nature's] dooings, with no small argument to the incredulous of that first accursed fall of *Adam*: sith our erected wit maketh vs know what perfection is, and yet our infected will keepeth vs from reaching vnto it." Then he adds: "But these arguments wil by fewe be vnderstood, and by fewer granted."[34] He means in part that, from our having eaten of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, we know that we ought to do well; but our will is corrupt and by

[29] Smith, p. 159.
[30] *Poetice*, I, ii (p. 13); I, i (p. 2).
[31] *Poetice*, III, xcvii (p. 368). See Smith, I, 392.
[32] Smith, pp. 174-175.
[33] Smith, p. 171.
[34] Smith, p. 157.

nature we cannot be moved to do well. For this reason, he defines the work of the right poet in terms of the image which moves our infected will. Since poetry presents images of what should be, "things not affirmatiuely but allegorically and figuratiuelie written," Sidney urges readers that "in Poesie, looking for fiction, they shal vse the narration but as an imaginatiue groundplot of a profitable inuention."[35] How he intends the readers to use the poet's fiction only as an imaginative groundplot may be gathered from his own reading of heroical poetry:

> The Poet nameth *Cyrus* or *Aeneas* no other way then to shewe what men of theyr fames, fortunes, and estates should doe.
>
> Only let *Aeneas* be worne in the tablet of your memory... and I thinke... hee will be found in excellencie fruitefull.
>
> Whom doe not the words of *Turnus* mooue? the tale of *Turnus* hauing planted his image in the imagination.
>
> [The poet] bestow[s] a *Cyrus* vpon the worlde, to make many *Cyrus's*, if they wil learne aright why and how that Maker made him.[36]

From these remarks, it is clear that Sidney believes that poetry may move the infected will because its images "strike, pierce, [and] possesse the sight of the soule."[37] When he writes that the poets "deliuer" a golden world, and that their work may "breed" fruitful knowledge and "plant" goodness in the soul, it is clear that he sees poetry as a Garden of Adonis containing the forms to be planted as seeds in man's imagination. Its end is to guide man on the way to salvation: "of all Sciences ... is our Poet the Monarch. For he dooth not only show the way, but giueth so sweete a prospect into the way, as will intice any man to enter into it."[38]

Since poetry shows the way, Sidney constantly uses light as a metaphor to describe its power; thus he writes that poetry possesses "the sight of the soule," by its images wisdom is "illuminated or figured foorth," and its pictures give "insight" into all the virtues and vices in order to make us "see the forme of goodnes." The metaphor culminates in his claim that through poetry "all vertues, vices, and passions so in their own naturall seates [are] layd to the viewe, that wee seeme not to heare of them, but cleerely to see through them."[39] What poetry presents is revelation, a vision of the golden world.

Thus Sidney gives poetry a power beyond moving, which the sixteenth-century Italian critics allowed—it moves *upwards* and so supplements the power of grace. By re-creating its vision of the golden

[35] Smith, p. 185. Ponsonby's edition, ed. A. S. Cook (Boston, 1890), is more explicit: "looking but for fiction" (p. 36).
[36] Smith, pp. 186, 179-180, 173, 157.
[37] Smith, p. 164.
[38] Smith, p. 172.
[39] Smith, p. 166.

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN · KANSAS

world, the reader may be moved to that virtuous action through which he may be redeemed. Scaliger suggests in a passage cited previously that poetry may lead man to that perfect action which is called beatitude ("consequatur homo perfectam actionem, quae nominatur Beatitudo"); but this statement does not imply much more than the conventional view that poetry aids morality. The only adequate analogue to Sidney's view of the end of poetry is Dante's statement that the end of the *Commedia* is "to remove those living in this life from a state of misery, and to bring them to a state of happiness."[40]

In his *Apology* Sidney integrates the major tradition of literary criticism: his threefold division of the poets answers but also includes Plato's view of poetry, his poetic is firmly based upon Aristotle's theory, and he uses the sixteenth-century Italian critics in order to reach a fuller understanding of the end of poetry. In using earlier criticism, he is not like the second kind of poet who "takes not the course of his owne inuention," but like one of the right poets who are "indeede makers of themselues." Whatever he finds in Scaliger, as I have tried to show, he re-creates. As a right poet, he delivers the Idea of what poetry should be; and the end of his treatise is through delightful teaching to defend poetry from the *Mysomousoi*, with the further end of moving the age to make the highest kind of poetry. Sidney's first editor, Olney, refers in the Preface to "Excellent Poesie so created by this *Apologie*"; it is this original argument of the Idea of the "right Poet" which gives his treatise its place as the *De Poetica* of our language.

University of Washington

[40] "Letter to Can Grande," in *The Letters of Dante*, trans. Paget Toynbee (Oxford, 1920), p. 202.

CONRAD'S *UNDER WESTERN EYES* AND MANN'S *DOCTOR FAUSTUS*

JULIAN B. KAYE

THE teacher of English who is the narrator of Conrad's *Under Western Eyes* speculates, in pre-1914 Switzerland, on the fundamental difference between Russians and Western Europeans: "I think sometimes that the profound secret of that people consists in this, that they detest life, the irremediable life of the earth as it is, whereas we westerners cherish it with perhaps an equal exaggeration of its sentimental value."[1] The narrator of *Doctor Faustus*—Serenus Zeitblom, also a teacher of languages—repeatedly observes, among Germans, the same disdain of ordinary life.[2]

Each of these novels is ostensibly the factual account, written by an honest and intelligent although rather limited philologist and pedagogue, of the life of a tragic figure who is both angelic and diabolical. The hero of *Under Western Eyes*, Razumov, *is* Russia; and the hero of *Doctor Faustus*, Leverkühn, *is* Germany.

Doctor Faustus, with its critique of German history and civilization, its brilliant parodies, its elaborate system of leitmotivs, is a more monumental work than *Under Western Eyes*. Moreover, Mann takes great pains to incorporate most of the thematic material in the various versions of the Faust story into his work.[3] Nevertheless, Mann's treatment of his subject—the method of narration, the relation of the narrator to both "story" and author, the characterization, the attribution of value to events and themes—is very much influenced by his reading of Conrad, particularly of *Under Western Eyes*.

Mann had been an admirer and a discriminating critic of Conrad's work for many years when he wrote *Doctor Faustus* (1943-47). In the preface to the German edition of *The Secret Agent*,[4] he observed that to him the significance of Conrad's career lay in the decision of the Pole to become an Englishman, which led in turn to his becoming an English writer. In Mann's opinion, Conrad's love of the English language was partly motivated by his detestation of the Russian autocracy, of which he had been both a subject and a victim.[5] Conrad's passionate

[1] New Classics edition, New Directions, 1951, p. 104. All citations of the text are to this edition.

[2] Thomas Mann, *Doctor Faustus*, trans. H. T. Lowe-Porter (New York, 1948), pp. 36-37, 173-174, 364-370, etc. All citations of the text are to this edition.

[3] See C. E. Reed, "Thomas Mann and the Faust Tradition," *JEGP*, LI (1952), 17-54, for a study of Mann's use of Faust material.

[4] Reprinted in *Past Masters and Other Papers*, trans. H. T. Lowe-Porter (New York, 1933), pp. 231-247.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 235, 239; see also Mann's "This War" in *Order of the Day*, trans.

love of freedom Mann found not only praiseworthy in itself but exemplary to the cultivated German public, which had unfortunately remained indifferent to political and social questions. Indeed, he went so far as to speculate that Conrad's lack of popularity in Germany had been due to his strong partisanship for free institutions and for British legalism. He hoped that a German edition of Conrad's work might be a sign of rapprochment with "the humanistic and liberal West."[6] For Mann, Conrad's liberalism—more admirable because Conrad was a severe critic of the failings of the bourgeois liberalism of the West—was a powerful weapon against the antidemocratic majority in Germany.

One may also say that for Mann Conrad was a symbol of the proper concern of the artist and the humanist with politics. It is significant that, both in his polemical writings of the 1930s and 1940s and in *Doctor Faustus*, Mann reiterates that the principal fault of German culture has been its lack of concern with "the political and social sphere." With this he parallels the German depreciation of the human and exaltation of the divine and the demonic.

From his journal, *Die Entstehung des Doktor Faustus*, we learn that Mann's attitude toward Conrad remained unchanged. During 1946, when he was completing *Doctor Faustus*, he reread most of Conrad's works.[7] Struck by the extraordinary variety of Conrad's gifts as a literary artist, he bemoaned the lack of such talents in German fiction: "... als Deutscher irgendwie beschämt durch eine männliche, abenteuerliche und sprachlich hochstehende, psychologisch-moralisch tiefe Erzählungskunst, wie sie bei uns nicht nur selten ist, sondern fehlt" (p. 168).

Perhaps Mann was thinking about claiming this combination for *Doctor Faustus*. His observation that reading the novels of Conrad is a reaction suitable to the writing of *Doctor Faustus* seems to corroborate this conjecture. At any rate, the words he uses to describe Conrad's art are applicable to his own novel (p. 186).

From Mann's comments one may infer that he considered *Under Western Eyes* the novel of Conrad which is closest to his own work. He calls it Conrad's masterpiece and indicates that he cannot put it down. (He is seventy-one years old, he is rereading the book, and he is

Eric Sutton (New York, 1942), p. 212, where he identifies the British Empire with the English language: "The British World Empire is more than an empire, it is a civilization. It is the Empire of the English language—a quiet but powerful language, with a unifying, binding, colonizing force which no others, though they have also produced great literature, neither German, nor Italian, nor French, can enter into competition."

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 237-238.

[7] Thomas Mann, *Die Entstehung des Doktor Faustus* (Amsterdam, 1949), pp. 168, 186.

determined not to go to sleep until he has finished all or most of it!) But more important, we know that he is—and probably has been for a long time—familiar with the applicability of Conrad's theme to Germany; he notes an article about Germany by Stephen Spender which bears the same title as Conrad's book (p. 168).

It is, however, the internal evidence of influence that is convincing, particularly the extraordinary similarity of narrative technique. Both stories are ostensibly purely factual accounts compiled, after the death of the protagonist, by an elderly professor of languages. Both narrators seem morbidly anxious to disclaim the fact that they are writing novels. Again and again they tiresomely tell the reader that they are not artists, that they are historians or biographers or editors or educators.[8] They even introduce long documents written by their subject. The determination of Conrad's narrator not to be a novelist goes so far that he refuses "even to invent a transition" (p. 100). Mann's narrator repeatedly discusses the order of narration of incidents and the proper length of chapters.[9]

These protestations serve a variety of purposes. In one sense, the reader takes them at face value. He is never able to forget that what he is experiencing is fact, not fiction. Thus the symbolic roles of the narrator and the other fictional characters are emphasized. By the same device the author detaches himself from the narrator, with whom the reader would otherwise completely identify him. Mann and Conrad, as artists, maintain an identity distinct from that of the unartistic narrator, which is essential if the narrator is not to become, like Marcel of *Remembrance of Things Past*, the principal character of the novel. Moreover, the role of the narrator as symbol of Western values demands that he be limited. Although both Conrad and Mann are partisans of the West, neither wishes to say that the West is without faults or that its opponents are completely wrong. Both as artists and as critics such a view would kill their subject. Ambiguity and irony are given ample scope in the relationships between narrator and author and what is narrated. All the qualifications that shade Conrad's and Mann's approval of the liberalism of the West are symbolized by the narrator: lack of intensity, lack of imagination, satisfaction with mediocrity.

Ironically, it is just those qualities in which the narrator is deficient that are important in the "story" and that attract him to the "story." The insane intensity and morbid imagination of Razumov and Leverkühn, unqualified, lead to their destruction and the destruction of others. Thus the values, even the limitations, of the narrator are justi-

[8] See *Under Western Eyes*, pp. 3, 66-67, 100, etc.; see also *Doctor Faustus*, pp. 3-4, 176, 221-222, 251, 295, 330, etc.

[9] See *Doctor Faustus*, pp. 4-5, 30-31, 70-71, 175-176, 251, 397 *et passim*.

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE LIBRARY APR 11 1957 MANHATTAN KANSAS

fied; but at the same time the reader feels that the hero, wrongheaded and doomed, is more important than the narrator.

The narrator is a humanist, but the hero is human—he is *naked* man.[10] Like the country he represents, he lives in a void. Razumov, as an illegitimate child whose mother is dead and whose father refuses to recognize him officially, is isolated, "without domestic tradition." He thinks of Russia (Mother Russia) as his mother. Leverkühn, who abandons his natural parents because he seeks the isolation which he believes is necessary for his work, searches for parental substitutes. One of his friends refers to the women in whose homes he has boarded as Mère Manardi, Mère Schweigestill (p. 392). Concomitant with the search for a mother is the desire to return to the womb. Razumov feels secure in Switzerland only when he sits in a garden on an island in Lake Geneva (p. 291). Leverkühn finally settles on a farm that corresponds almost exactly to his childhood home (pp. 25-27). Both succeed, at a terrible cost, in returning to a state of infantile dependence on maternal care—Leverkühn to his natural mother (pp. 508-509) and Razumov to Tekla, who has made a career of being a foster mother to defeated adults (p. 379).

This case history is in both novels conceived as political as well as individual. Both Germany and Russia are represented as xenophobic, reactionary, at the same time self-hating and arrogant. Both nations, like both heroes, are seen as paralyzed and moribund at the end of the novel (Mann's Germany literally so).

Both personal and political also is the hero's pact with the Devil. Again Mann is more explicit than Conrad—probably because of the Faust theme. Both pacts are described as imaginary, But Leverkühn's pact—with its naturalistic basis in his deliberate risking of venereal infection and his lack of perseverance in effecting a cure when he finds out that he is diseased— is less a figure of speech than Razumov's. This is true despite the fact that the narrator of *Under Western Eyes* compares the conversations of Razumov with the Russian Intelligence Officer Councillor Mikulin to "... old legendary tales where the Enemy of Mankind is represented holding subtly mendacious dialogues with some tempted soul..." (pp. 304-305). In the same way, one may say that Nazi Germany's pact with the Devil is less a figure of speech than Czarist Russia's.

Leverkühn's childhood and youth are spent in an atmosphere which is permeated by the diabolical—in history, in religion, in theology, in psychology. In his isolation, his demonism, his lovelessness, Leverkühn is himself diabolical. Razumov too is demonic (his demonism, like Leverkühn's, is symbolized by his laughter); he too conceives of him-

[10] For a discussion of the implications of this theme, see R. P. Blackmur, "Parody and Critique: Notes on Mann's *Doctor Faustus*," *Kenyon Review*, XII (1950), 20-40.

self as playing a diabolical role as the betrayer of Haldin, as the man who thrashes Ziemianitch mercilessly (Ziemianitch believes that he has been beaten by the Devil for his sins), and, most important, as a police spy.

Leverkühn has feverish conversations with the Devil; to Razumov the Devil is almost always a figure of speech. Leverkühn's physical destruction is quite explicitly a result of his pact with the Devil; Razumov's is not. Analogically, Germany is quite literally destroyed at the end of World War II, while Czarist Russia is conceived as suffering from spiritual rather than physical paralysis. But the significance, both personal and political, of the destruction of the seduced soul is the same in both books. Leverkühn must be physically destroyed so that he may repent his sins and be saved. Razumov must confess his sins and submit to a punishment which, although inflicted by guilt and cruelty, is just. Because he has been a spy, his ear drums are broken and he becomes completely deaf. Moribund, he learns wisdom and becomes a trusted friend and counselor of the revolutionists by whom he was condemned.

In both novels the relationship of personal to political in the lives of the narrator and his subject is strengthened by the apportionment of symbolic roles to nations. Both authors contrast Switzerland, which becomes a symbol of the West, with the authoritarian nation which the hero represents. Quite naturally, many of the virtues and faults of the narrator are identified with those of Switzerland. Switzerland is humanistic, democratic, rational, orderly, benevolent—in a word, decent; but it is without the heroic virtues as well as the diabolical vices. It is small, both in physical size and in aims, impersonal and impassive, self-satisfied and rather dull.

A bare listing of faults and merits, however, does not do justice to our novelists' partisanship for the West. Switzerland's virtues, like those of the narrator, are substantial; her vices, generally sins of omission, are pointed out primarily for dramatic conflict and for the edification of Western readers. Moreover, disparaging remarks about Switzerland are often made by characters whom the author considers wrongheaded or biased; for example, much of Razumov's bitterness against Switzerland stems from the fact that the defense of Russian autocracy is the only possible defense of his betrayal of Haldin. Most conclusive of all is the paradox which is reiterated by both Conrad and Mann: Switzerland is small, but it is the world; Germany and Russia are large, but they are provincial.

The hero's lack of ease in Switzerland is identified with his—and his country's—provinciality, xenophobia, loneliness, inability to love or understand others. It is another paradox of both novels that Switzerland—passionless, emotionally tepid—is the stage for the love of both

heroes. Razumov meets Nathalie Haldin in Geneva (pp. 167-174); Leverkühn meets Marie Godeau—who is French Swiss—in Zürich (pp. 417-421). In *Doctor Faustus* Switzerland is associated with married love, with a commitment to the Aristotelian mean and an avoidance of both the diabolical and the divine. Specifically, the ideal of marriage is identified with Leverkühn's brother-in-law, whose Swiss accent and temperament are emphasized (pp. 185-186); and one of the children of his marriage, Nepomuk, whose speech is also Swiss (p. 462), is Leverkühn's last hope for love.

To both Mann and Conrad the identification of Switzerland with human love is also political. Constitutional government with its legal liberties is linked with marriage and with married love.[11] The characters who scorn the one as petty and limited are likely to scorn the other. Certainly, almost all the Russians in *Under Western Eyes* and almost all the Germans in *Doctor Faustus* feel nothing but contempt for freedom and legality. The Russians who are in revolt against the Czarist government have the same faith in violence and force as their oppressors.

In both novels most of these totalitarians—in *Under Western Eyes* Russian revolutionists living in Geneva and in *Doctor Faustus* German artists and intellectuals living in Munich—form a group that provides a background for the hero and relates his values to those of his nation. The attitude of the hero toward this group is detached and at times contemptuous; but he nevertheless regards its members as being in a sense his peers. When he feels that the time has come for him to confess his guilt and expiate his sins, he does so before them. Razumov confesses his espionage (pp. 365-366), Leverkühn his pact with the Devil (pp. 496-503); and the end is physical collapse.[12]

It is obvious that *Under Western Eyes* is but one source, albeit an important one, of Mann's encyclopaedic synthesis of European history and culture. But it is instructive to observe one writer using the literary experience of another to stimulate his own imagination.

Brooklyn College

[11] See *Doctor Faustus*, pp. 383, 186-188; see also *Under Western Eyes*, pp. 114, 106.

[12] *Doctor Faustus*, pp. 503, 505-510; and *Under Western Eyes*, pp. 368-371, 373-374, 379.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CRISIS OF THE EARLY ITALIAN RENAISSANCE. CIVIC HUMANISM AND REPUBLICAN LIBERTY IN AN AGE OF CLASSICISM AND TYRANNY. By Hans Baron. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1955. 2 vols. xxix, 378, x, 656 p.

HUMANISTIC AND POLITICAL LITERATURE IN FLORENCE AND VENICE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE QUATTROCENTO. By Hans Baron. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955. viii, 223 p.

Uno dei caratteri più facilmente dimostrabili, e quindi più tetragoni, dell'Umanesimo, è che esso, con i suoi motivi, poté bensì trovarsi mescolato di continuo alla vicenda politica; non tanto però che per qualcosa esso non continuasse a trascenderla: segno che l'aveva trascesa fin dalla nascita, e che questo di trascenderla faceva parte dei suoi caratteri costituzionali.

Il B. è senz'altro uno studioso intelligente, colto, diligente: ma con il torto o di essersi illuso di poter capovolgere questo luogo comune, o di averlo capovolto senz'accorgersene. Su tale capovolgimento, infatti, si basano ambedue questi libri, specialmente il primo, dove la storia del mondo spirituale, cioè dell'umanesimo, è presentata come confluente nella storia politica, e l'identificarsi di ambedue dovrebbe risultare da un famoso episodio del primissimo Quattrocento: lo scontro tra la libera Repubblica Fiorentina, e la milanese tirannide viscontea. La cosa è già implicita nel titolo: il sottotitolo la propone e impone esplicitamente fin dal primo inciso, con l'accostamento di un aggettivo e un sostantivo, "civic humanism," assolutamente alieni dall'abitudine di trovarsi insieme. Inutile dire che il seguito di una tal premessa non può essere che altrettanto compromettente; e difatti lo è. La copula *e*, che nel primo rigo congiunge quasi endiadicamente l'idea di libertà repubblicana e l'idea di un umanesimo diventato suo patrono in funzione di civico, nel secondo rigo si fa avversativa, e contrappone come due entità avverse l'idea di classicismo e l'idea di tirannide.

Che è appunto la tesi del libro. Orbene, il B. non è un improvvisatore. Di prima o di seconda mano, le notizie che egli mette innanzi sono sempre frutto di letture sue. Se dunque con questa sua ricerca, per quanto di carattere compilativo, egli si fosse limitato a voler mitigare, o anche radicalmente impugnare la vecchia tesi ottocentesca di un umanesimo fatto da retori sprovvisti di passioni o ideali che non fossero pura letteratura, e avesse dimostrato che invece, cancellieri o oratori, al servizio di una repubblica o al servizio di una signoria, molti di essi, primo il Petrarca, capitando l'occasione sapevano fare le cose per benino, s'appassionavano alla loro parte e la corroboravano con gli argomenti di cui erano in possesso, quelli della loro cultura, nulla ci sarebbe stato da eccepire. Non sarebbe stata una tesi nuova, ma sarebbe stata una tesi giusta, e degna di venir ribadita contro qualche ritardatario, e da uno studioso preparatissimo.

Peccato che andando più in là il B. l'abbia trasfigurata.

La sua tesi è, dunque, che all'alba del secolo quindicesimo fu la libera Repubblica Fiorentina a precludere al tiranno Gian Galeazzo Visconti la strada del Sud, e questo in nome della libertà, e con gran vantaggio degli Italiani, i quali ci rimisero bensì l'unificazione d'Italia o di una parte d'Italia, ma salvarono essi la libertà: Parigi val bene una messa.

Ed è, come si diceva una volta, una tesi senza capo né coda. Sulla maggiore o minore efficacia dello sforzo militare fiorentino in quell'evento si potrà discutere: circa il vantaggio venuto agli Italiani dal fallimento di Gian Galeazzo, forse non è neppur possibile discutere: resta sempre valido, contro il Machiavelli fanatico

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE LIBRARY APR 11 1957 MANHATTAN KANSAS

dell'unità, il giudizio del Guicciardini, che la gloria massima e inconfutabile dell'Italia, quella d'aver avuto nel Rinascimento non una, ma molte capitali dello spirito, cioè tante capitali quante erano le capitali dei suoi piccoli stati, la gloria insomma d'aver avuto essa l'Umanesimo, e d'essere stata essa tutta una capitale dello spirito, è collegata alla sfortuna politica di non essere stata unificata. Fin qua il B. e il Guicciardini sono all'unisono. Dove invece il Guicciardini, risorgendo, comincerebbe a turarsi le orecchie, sarebbe all'udire la vittoria dei Fiorentini attribuita dal B. al loro "umanesimo": cioè al sentimento di libertà in essi infuso dall'umanesimo, e fatta quindi preludio di quella libertà che si chiamerà un giorno in Italia libertà nazionale. Da questo punto in avanti, il libro del B. non è che un libro sbagliato, nel quale la storia civile e la storia dell'Umanesimo, invece di incontrarsi, secondo le intenzioni del suo autore, si scontrano in ogni passo.

Perché, quale che fosse in quella particolarissima occasione il valore dei Fiorentini, quello che in ogni caso avrebbe fatto fallire lo sforzo unificativo di Gian Galeazzo, magari dopo un effimero successo iniziale, *sarebbe stato proprio l'Umanesimo*, il cui più visibile coefficiente ideologico e sentimentale fu un orgoglio di universalità incapace di sacrificarsi all'idea di nazione: fu, insomma, quel retaggio ideale per cui l'Italia, anche se spiritualmente unita, fu forse l'ultima delle nazioni europee a profondamente sentire l'impulso alla libertà nazionale intesa come autonomia nazionale.

Che nonostante il fascino persistente della storia imperiale romana, i più degli umanisti se la facessero meglio con gli eroi dell'età repubblicana, è cosa risaputa. Fin dalle prime scuole, in Italia usa contrapporre il Medioevo imperiale e l'Umanesimo repubblicano, contrapponendo il fanatismo di Dante per Cesare eroe dell'Impero e il fanatismo del Petrarca per Scipione eroe della Repubblica.

E con ciò? Forse che per questo il Petrarca era più vicino di Dante al concetto di libertà nazionale, inteso come autonomia nazionale? Ma nemmeno per sogno! Il valore "universalità" che la Repubblica romana sprigiona nello spirito del Petrarca è lo stesso che sprigiona l'Impero in quello di Dante, e l'anatema del primo contro il *novum monstrum*, la nazione, è perfino più appassionato che quello del secondo. Ecco le sue parole precise: "Monstruosum est enim omne animal biceps: quanto magis horrendum et immane prodigium est animal mille capitum diversorum seseque mordentium invicemque pugnantium! Quodsi capita plura sint, unum tamen quod cunta compescat atque omnibus presit esse debere non ambigitur, ut *totius corporis pax inconcussa permaneat*" (Petrarca, *Liber sine nomine*, ed. Piur, pp. 175-176). Ora, che i Fiorentini fieramente si difendessero dai Milanesi, e, in quanto per il momento repubblicani, si riattaccassero ai motivi repubblicani come i Milanesi di Gian Galeazzo a motivi dello stato forte, chi se ne sorprende? E come sarebbe potuto avvenire altrimenti? Questo però sarebbe avvenuto anche senza gli umanisti. I quali, naturalmente, come genuini rappresentanti della classe colta, parteciparono alla guerra con gli argomenti della cultura che allora aveva il suo fondamento nella storia romana; ma il rapporto fra la resistenza fiorentina el il loro umanesimo non ha proprio che vedere con quello immaginato dal B.: e non perché essi non fossero sinceri, o perché possa valere a contestazione di questa loro sincerità la facilità con cui, dopo questa provvisoria libertà fiorentina, s'adattarono alla tirannide (humanum est...); ma perché nelle loro coscienze, diremo meglio nella loro cultura, il mondo antico era una cosa molto più grande del fatto politico Repubblica o del fatto politico Impero (posso permettermi di rimandare a un mio libriccino di questi giorni, *L'uomo antico nel pensiero del Rinascimento*, Bologna, 1957?), e implicava tutta una concezione etica. Era quella concezione la vera sostanza dell'Umanesimo; e piuttosto che incontrarsi, si scontrava con il concetto di nazione. Proprio essa impedisce a noi studiosi di fare degli umanisti repubblicani l'Umanesimo vero, e degli altri l'umanesimo

falso; o di comunque sorprenderci, col Baron, "why Salutati considered it opportune, or even permissible, to defend his point of view by writing an unqualified apology of monarchy in midst of a Florentine war for liberty, and at almost the same time when, in his *Invectiva*, he publicly defended republican life against monarchy" (I, 133).

No: a noi proprio con il *De tyranno* alla mano sarebbe facile ricondurre quell'apparente contraddizione del suo autore, il Salutati, allo stato d'animo di tutti gli umanisti, anche di quelli di Gian Galeazzo, solo che sugli *i* dei loro periodi i punti fossero messi dove vanno messi.

Come però questo non c'è concesso di fare per tutte le citazioni del B., lo faremo per una sola, ma non secondaria, se in un libro destinato a dimostrare cotesto civismo umanistico, egli l'ha riservata alla conclusione, e nella conclusione—direbbe uno dei vecchi maestri di stilistica—la ha posta in posizione enfatica, adoperando per essa le parole più impegnative di tutta l'opera, e trascrivendola in nota per intero (ma, ahimé, con qualche lacuna). E si capisce questa preferenza. Fra tutti questi umanisti fiorentini, nessuno è più caro al B. del Bruni, perchè nessuno gli appare più conforme alla tesi da lui sostenuta. Naturale dunque che nella conclusione, volendo lasciare l'impressione di cotesta inoppugnabile interferenza fra la storia della libertà e la storia della cultura, come teorizzata dall'Umanesimo, egli torni al suo Bruni per quella che gli pare la più probante e la più inoppugnabile tra le pagine da lui scritte a questo proposito. Dice adunque il Baron:

"In the long history of the Renaissance idea, this is the first clear conception of the vital interrelationship between the humanistic movement and the Florentine city-state. Before long, the implicit new historical vista was being developed fully by Bruni himself. In his *Vita di Petrarca*, in 1436, he set forth the theory that already in antiquity, and again in the post-Roman centuries of Italian history, the fortunes of the free city-state had determined the ascent and descent of culture" (*The Crisis*, I, 363).

Tutto questo si riferisce al seguente passo della *Vita di Petrarca* del Bruni come è citato dal Baron (II, 620-621):

"E puossi dire che le lettere e gli studi della lingua latina andassero parimente con lo stato della repubblica di Roma; perocchè insino all'età di Tullio ebbe accrescimento, di poi, perduta la libertà del popolo romano per la signoria degl'imperadori... insieme col buono stato della città di Roma perì la buona disposizione degli studi e delle lettere... A che proposito si dice questo da me? Solo per dimostrare, che, come la città di Roma fu annichilata dagl'imperadori perversi tiranni, così gli studi e le lettere latine riceverono simile ruina e diminuzione, intanto che all'estremo quasi non si trovava chi lettere latine con alcuna gentilezza sapesse. E sopravvennero in Italia i Goti e i Longobardi, nazioni barbare e strane, i quali affatto quasi spensero ogni cognizione di lettere... Ricuperata di poi la libertà de' popoli italici per la cacciata de' Longobardi... le città di Toscana e altre cominciarono a riaversi e a dare opera agli studi ed alquanto limare il grosso stile. E così a poco a poco vennero ripigliando vigore," until Petrarch "rivocò in luce l'antica leggiadria dello stile perduto e spento."

Lette così, queste parole fanno una grande impressione, e ci richiamano ai tempi del *Niccolò de' Lapi* di Massimo d'Azeglio, quando i patrioti del Risorgimento postulavano la vittoria delle libertà nazionali da quella che s'immaginava già raggiunta dai liberi Comuni. Se però nella citazione voi inserite anche i pochi incisi che il Baron, in assoluta buona fede, ha eliminati e riassunti in quel "until Petrarch," le cose cambiano. V'accorgete allora che, quale che fosse il rapporto dal Bruni prospettato tra libertà e cultura, ciò non pertanto anche per lui, come per ogni umanista, restava una gran distanza tra il risorgimento culturale delle

libere città-stato di Toscana, e il risorgimento dell'Umanesimo; e che questo non dipendeva affatto da quello. Mentre le prime "cominciarono a riaversi—scrive il Bruni—ed a dare opera a gli studi ed alquanto limare il grosso stile, e così a poco a poco vennero ripigliando vigore, *ma molto debilmente e senza vero giudizio di gentilezza alcuna*, più tosto attendendo a dire in rima volgare, che ad altro..." fu solo il Petrarca "il primo il quale ebbe tanta grazia d'ingegno, che riconobbe e rivocò in luce l'antica leggiadria dello stile perduto e spento" (Bruni, in Solerti, p. 290).

E che cosa implica dunque una tale differenza tra questi due risorgimenti culturali, quello delle libere città, e quello dell'Umanesimo? Oh, una cosa molto grave, così sul piano politico come per rispetto al concetto di libertà.

Perché, nel fresco amore dei volgari delle libere città (e pieno veramente di *gentilezza*, checché ne dica il Bruni), c'era anche quella rivolta al latino, nella quale era preminente il sentimento dell'autonomia nazionale. Proprio quel sentimento del quale il Bruni non voleva sapere, come fosse barbarie, e negazione di gentilezza; e non voleva saperne come non aveva voluto saperne il suo Petrarca. Ed era essenzialmente in questo che egli si sentiva all'unisono con lui, e ne scriveva la vita.

Con tutto ciò, s'intende, gli umanisti erano uomini come gli altri, vivevano la vita del loro tempo, e non questo universalismo teorico impediva loro di parteggiare all'occasione per lo stato in cui si trovavano, e, quando era repubblica, di spalleggiarlo con i motivi e i ricordi della Repubblica romana. Ma questo nel loro umanesimo era tanto marginale e contingente e sostituibile, quanto era insostituibile e perenne e sostenuto da un vero e proprio orgoglio di casta quell'ideale sopranazionale che aveva ispirato l'invettiva contro il *novum monstrum* al Petrarca, e ispirava il Bruni a scrivere la vita di lui. Tutte cose intese benissimo dal Machiavelli, il quale, saturo per tanti rispetti di una sensibilità umanistica tutta rivagliata sulle glorie repubblicane descritte da Livio (basta leggere i *Discorsi sulla prima Deca*), quando poi contro il Guicciardini si pone il problema dell'unità nazionale diventa di colpo antiumanista, *cioè sente di non poter contare menomamente sui motivi e gli ideali degli umanisti*, e, disperato della sordità di costoro al suo ideale, s'aspetta l'unità solo da un feroce conquistatore, e lo esalta come tale non per amor di tirannide, ma perché non vede altra via.

Questo per dire brevemente come il "civic humanism" del Baron resti sfocato anche nelle citazioni che egli ha ragione di ritenere più pertinenti, e sono in effetti eccezionali. Non diciamo poi di altre, riferite ad altri motivi. Non si sente il Baron tremare la penna quando scrive le seguenti parole? "He did not overlook the weaknesses in Cicero's character which had repelled Petrarch" (I, 100). No, Prof. Baron; Petrarca davanti a Cicerone stava in ginocchio, né più, né meno; e com'è possibile puntare su un particolare marginale per dare una così sviante rappresentazione di un uomo e di un' età? Cose anche più gravi andrebbero dette a proposito del modo come il cosiddetto paganesimo degli umanisti viene collegato (o scollegato) col "civic humanism." Il Baron non ignora, pare, la critica dei predecessori a questo paganesimo; ma anche nell'accettarla qua e là, quanta approssimazione! Dove parla d'un conflitto tra l'antiromanesimo di sant'Agostino e il romanesimo degli umanisti, fra la sete di gloria dei Romani, e la presunta condanna fattane dal Cristianesimo, dove parla dell'umanesimo come paganesimo progressivo dal Boccaccio al Salutati, egli è semplicemente inaccettabile. Ed io anche qui mi permetto di richiamarmi ad un mio libriccino citato più su.

E non già ch'io non veda quale scorrettezza sarebbe pretendere di impugnare le idee di un libro con un categorico rinvio a un altro libro. Ma questa recensione è ormai troppo lunga. Qui non si tratta di confutare: si tratta di dare al lettore un avvio bibliografico. D'altra parte, il Baron a certo punto scrive:

"The possible effects of classicism in the realm of religious sentiment have scarcely been weighed in recent studies of the early Quattrocento crisis. In the beginnings of modern scholarship the supposed 'paganism' of the fifteenth-century Renaissance was for a while emphasized so disproportionately that in reaction a strong inclination has developed to depreciate this element. But though this depreciation may be correct in a general verdict on the character of the Renaissance, it need not exclude the possibility that in some specific stages the fresh awareness of classical religiosity may have acted as a spur to radical and militant trains of thought" (I, 269).

Orbene, dato che questa "strong inclination to depreciate this element" fa capo a me, io a questo punto ho l'impressione di esser chiamato in causa. Se così fosse, non avrei bisogno di scusarmi del rimando a quel mio libro e ai miei libri: si tratterebbe di continuare con il Baron un colloquio da lui iniziato. Ma se così non fosse, poichè in effetti il Baron non mi nomina se non in una noticina remota, così remota che poi gli sfugge di trasferire il mio nome nell'indice, questo rimando potrebbe servire a colmare nella bibliografia del libro una lacuna.

Cose analoghe si potrebbero dire a proposito della seconda opera del prof. Baron: dove però è ripreso e continuato il discorso su un famoso libro, *Il Paradiso degli Alberti*; ed è ripreso e continuato con molte e felici osservazioni, anche se non fa progredire la questione se di esso si debba parlare come di un'opera umanistica, o come di un'opera antiumanistica. Alcune osservazioni però vanno in fondo.

Chiara dunque la conclusione di queste nostre pagine. Se la così detta impostazione storica del libro è suscettibile di molte riserve, nessuna riserva è possibile a proposito della preparazione storica. Erudito scrupoloso, quello che si doveva e poteva vedere il B. l'ha veduto tutto. Molto materiale di cui altri non s'erano serviti è stato messo in valore per la prima volta da lui, specialmente nel secondo di questi due libri. Non potrà prescindere né dall'uno né dall'altro chi d'ora innanzi si rifaccia ad approfondire il delicato problema dei rapporti fra vita culturale e vita civile in quelli che forse sono gli anni chiave del nostro Rinascimento.

GIUSEPPE TOFFANIN

Università di Napoli

GOETHE-BIBLIOGRAPHIE. LIEFERUNG 1. By Hans Pyritz, with the editorial assistance of Paul Raabe. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1955. xvi, 80 p.

This, the first of eight projected issues of Pyritz' Goethe bibliography, contains two of the fourteen sections into which he has divided the material he intends to present. The two sections published in this volume, with a total of 996 titles, are "Goethe Research" and "Goethe Editions." The remaining sections will be devoted to Goethe's totality, Goethe's development, Goethe in relation to his contemporaries, Goethe's personality, Goethe's intellectual stature, Goethe's philosophy and outlook on life, Goethe as a natural scientist, Goethe as statesman and organizer, Goethe's publishing ventures, and his relationship to the arts and to the stage; Goethe as a poet, Goethe's technical works in various fields, the history of Goethe's influence.

Anyone familiar with the truly frightening complexity of Goethe scholarship will agree that these divisions, while arbitrary as all such divisions must be, do represent an optimum solution of one of the two problems involved in compiling a bibliography of the research done on Goethe (or Homer, or Shakespeare)—they represent as accurately as possible the horizontal dimension, the *extent* of work done on Goethe. But how does Pyritz tackle the other problem presented by a work

of this kind? How does he account for the vertical dimension, and judge the *value* of the work done within each of his divisions?

In the Provisional Foreword, the author explains in some detail the principles followed in separating the wheat from the chaff. He includes all works on Goethe which incorporate definitive and incontrovertible results, and likewise such items of scholarly research as are at least open to reasonable discussion. Added to this basic material are works which are antiquated in point of factual information, but which played a role in the history of ideas or served as milestones in the development of the *Goethebild*. Thus it seems a fair guess that, when the appropriate sections are published, half a dozen biographies of positivistic vintage will stand alongside the works of Gundolf and Simmel, Viëtor and Fairley. Specifically excluded, on the other hand, are popularizations, school texts, and books in which Goethe is primarily exploited for a political or other nonscholarly "cause." Excluded also are newspaper articles—not, one is glad to report, out of academic arrogance, which in the past caused some scholars to dismiss such writings as unworthy of their attention (and to forget two cardinal facts: Goethe himself was no mean journalist; and the most articulate among his contemporary critics, F. Schlegel and Schiller, likewise evaluated their great contemporary largely in newspapers and periodicals). Pyritz insists that "experience shows that news of scholarly relevance communicated in the press almost invariably turns up in scholarly writing" (p. vii); no one can quarrel with that. More questionable is the omission of book reviews. But their inclusion would have caused the book, which is intended to be eventually one volume, to "burst at the seams." Some compensation is offered by the inclusion of many "progress reports."

The author, or editor, has scrupulously refrained from applying value judgments—other than inclusion itself—to the material here offered. In the engagingly frank Provisional Foreword, Pyritz explains that he found it especially hard to express no opinion "on the revelations about Goethe with which the great minds of the twentieth century habitually regale their adoring public, sometimes in an astoundingly naive fashion. Those who know me will not misinterpret such reticence as an expression of weak objectivity, I happen to think that one cannot fulfill the function of censor, if it is to do any good at all, merely in passing."

The day of the all-inclusive bibliography à la Goedecke is long past. In thus frankly facing up to the necessity of making decisions, Pyritz himself is the first to admit that he is occasionally arbitrary, and that "strictly speaking, only he is entitled to select who knows the total quantity involved down to the last detail" (p vii.) But he is also right in adding that no one can any longer make this claim in regard to Goethe research, and that "the art of disregarding" is an essential part of scholarship. This reviewer does not claim to be a Goethe expert, but he is fairly familiar with the works here presented under the heading of "Goethe Research"; that section, and the one on "Goethe Editions," with which all of us have some familiarity, are as complete and as concise as one could wish. At the same time it must be admitted that the real test of Pyritz' principles of selection is yet to come. The line between Goethe's *Entwicklungsgeschichte* and *Personalität* is not one we would care to draw. But it must be drawn in any bibliography, and there is consolation in the fact that Pyritz, long known as editor of the new *Euphorion* and for his work on Marianne von Willemer, is as well qualified as any living scholar to do so.

The entry given consists, in each case, of author, title, place and date of publication, and, where applicable, subtitle and number of pages .Within the various subdivisions of a section, the arrangement is roughly chronological. It is to be hoped that the final issue, or the whole book, will contain an index of authors.

The need for a selective, up-to-date Goethe bibliography is so overwhelming

that even a work of lesser quality would have been welcome. Yet even a man like Pyritz, working on a "mere" bibliography, is liable to be looked at askance by a section of the "creative" academic public. A small sample may serve to illustrate that the author anticipates comments of this sort with so much wit and integrity that one occasionally regrets his treatment of the material *sine ira et studio*: "Some experts who self-contentedly swing along on the trapeze of their exegetic imagination may accuse me of doing a lowly task. I have not considered this work too humble to devote to it the energy of years, and many painfully saved hours which could no doubt have been spent more enjoyably and with greater glory for myself. Yet I should feel rewarded if it were given to this book to break down fashionable prejudices, and to form an example for others of similar scope" (p. v). If the remaining issues are of the same caliber as this first one, there is little doubt that Pyritz' wish will be granted.

WOLFGANG LEPPMANN

University of Oregon

DIDEROT EN ALLEMAGNE (1750-1850). By Roland Mortier. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1954. 464 p.

The purpose of Professor Mortier's book is to trace the fate which Diderot's works encountered in all German-speaking countries, including Austria, Switzerland, "and at times even Alsace," from the time of their publication or their first circulation in manuscript form up to approximately 1850, i.e., the time when the interest in Diderot became "retrospective and historical" (p. 301) and German Diderot scholarship was established (Karl Rosenkranz, *Diderot's Leben und Werke*, 1866). The book avoids not only all regionalism but also the type of French nationalism which looks at all German literature as second-rate and derived from the French. It would have been tempting to trace Diderot's influence on and superiority over German letters. But Professor Mortier has an entirely open mind, and discusses each German author on his own grounds; and he has, above all, a calm and superior objectivity which leads him to weigh each German statement on Diderot with the utmost care and justice.

The author does not propose to trace "influence"; in fact, he does not think in terms of influence. Actually, he is highly critical of scholarship which simplifies the problem of influence, and prefers to speak of "affinity" (e.g., p. 310, note 29, on Eggli's article "Diderot et Schiller"). Only on rare occasions does he see a direct influence, and even in these cases his cautious and circumspect investigation touches the problem very lightly. In the case of *Minna von Barnhelm*, e.g., he speaks of "the general tone of the play which evokes Diderot's sentimental tirades on magnanimity and virtue" (p. 78). And he rightly asks: Would not Lessing perhaps have continued in the vein of *Miss Sara Sampson*, if he had not in the meanwhile translated Diderot's plays?

The same cautious handling of the problem of influence is found in Mortier's discussion of Schiller's tales, one of the best in his book. He compares Schiller's tales written before his translations of the incident of Madame de la Pommeraye in *Jacques le fataliste* (*Merkwürdiges Beispiel einer weiblichen Rache*) with Schiller's later tales (p. 228) and he comes to the conclusion that Diderot, along with Laclos, was Schiller's model with regard to narrative technique, suspense, alternating of indifference and liveliness, search for the unforeseen and the surprising, disdain of superfluous ornaments, etc. In short, Schiller carefully observed, and learned from the technique of his French predecessors—a subtle type of influence much more important than any copying of motifs and themes.

The same is true in the case of E. T. A. Hoffmann who, according to Mortier, was influenced more strongly by Diderot than any other German writers. When he compares Hoffmann's *Ritter Gluck* with the *Neveu de Rameau*, he is of course quite right in pointing out that both protagonists have the same violent reaction to music, that Hoffmann took over some of the Nephew's gestures, etc. He might have added, however, that the general tone of the works is strikingly different and that the eighteenth-century *décadent* has nothing of the uncanny, eery appearance of the ghostlike Gluck, whose essence it is to draw the reader into his orbit rather than to create a satirical distance as Diderot's hero does.

The emphasis of the book is on the critical reaction of the German reading public to the various aspects of Diderot's diversified literary activities. This approach broadens the scope of the book and gives it its distinctive value. Mortier does not discuss the reactions of the major German authors—this has, in part, been done before and Mortier carefully avoids repetitions and clichés. He has primarily studied the literary and philosophical journals of the eighteenth century, such as the *Goettingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, and discusses at great length their reviews of Diderot's works. This thorough investigation brings to light much material rarely or never considered before. In the excellent bibliography there is a special section on these periodicals and the list is impressive.

While this method of investigation often describes excellently the climate of thought which was favorable or unfavorable to the reception of an author as contradictory and controversial as Diderot, it tends, at times, to put too much emphasis on second- and third-rate authors. Thus Mortier discusses at great length the "important compte rendu" of Diderot's *Contes moraux* by J. J. Engel in the *Bibliothek der deutschen Wissenchaften* (pp. 190-195), only to come to the conclusion (p. 196) that Engel, who is an *Aufklärer* par excellence, fights a rear guard battle in the climate of *Sturm und Drang* and actually had no influence at all. At times the method, thorough and pertinent though it is, becomes tedious and its real importance questionable.

The plan of the book, whose chapters are ordered according to Diderot's various writings, makes it impossible to give a complete picture of any single German author's reaction to the whole of Diderot's literary personality. Without the index it would be impossible to find all passages on any one German writer. This is an inevitable shortcoming and the author has made the most of the situation. There are some excellent discussions on single aspects of the problem, e.g., the reaction to the *Encyclopédie* of Hamann, who was first interested only in the emphasis on "arts et métiers," later rejected its utilitarian spirit completely, and finally returned to some of the most interesting articles, such as *Beau* or *Génie* (p. 150 ff.). We read with equal interest about Hamann's amazingly favorable reaction to Diderot's novels, including even the *Bijoux indiscrets* (p. 213, etc.), but an overall picture is missing. The bibliography has no section on German authors.

From the point of view of the main German authors, the chapter on the *Neveu de Rameau* stands out. The enthusiastic response of Schiller and Goethe, Hegel's philosophic interpretation, and its artistic influence on Hoffmann are forcefully brought into focus. It is in this chapter that one wonders most how important the study of the "climate of thought" actually is. The climate of thought was most unfavorable to the reception of the *Neveu*, and only a few great authors recognized its value. Seen from our distant viewpoint, the reaction of the reading public seems negligeable, and the enthusiasm of the great writers, based on a deeper insight, has the quality of a final judgment. The same holds true for the third-rate authors who were influenced by Diderot's bourgeois plays, but whose plays disappeared from the German scene as early as 1775.

However, Mortier's book bears the stamp of true scholarship for which no

bit of evidence is without importance. He is as interested and accurate in textual criticism as in the realm of ideas or artistic achievement. He understands Diderot as well as German literature, of which he has a vast knowledge. His discriminating characterization of the Schlegels and their vacillating attitude toward Diderot is as pertinent as his high evaluation of Schiller and his admiration for Goethe.

The fate of Diderot's works in Germany varied greatly. The unorthodox spirit of the *Encyclopédie* was acceptable only to the most radically "enlightened" Germans such as Wekhrlin, while Diderot as a dramatist was very favorably received by the bourgeois society of late eighteenth-century Germany. That the Germans were particularly receptive to Diderot's tales is a well-known fact. Actually those novels circulated in the *Correspondance Littéraire* were known and appreciated in Germany earlier than in France. The Schlegels could not but admire a novel such as *Jacques le fataliste*, which suited so well their idea of progressive universal poetry, with its mixed genres, loose plot, and that distinctive distance from its subject matter which is the main characteristic of romantic wit. Some of the aesthetic ideas also provoked discussion. That the timid and rather narrow-minded German public could not follow Diderot's often paradoxical and very unconventional philosophic ideas is not surprising. Only one Frenchman's philosophic ideas were acceptable to the Germans of 1770—Rousseau's. In the conflict between Rousseau and Diderot, which became such a poignant personal conflict, the truly surprising feature is, as Mortier points out, that Diderot did not entirely lose his German audience. These are only a few of the conclusions of Mortier's investigation. They are not all new, but they are all made credible and acceptable through his unbiased and well-balanced presentation.

LISELOTTE DIECKMANN

Washington University

MACHIAVELLI ANTICRISTO. By Giuseppe Prezzolini. Rome: Gherardo Casini Editore, 1954. viii, 477 p.

VITA DI NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI. By Roberto Ridolfi. Rome: Angelo Belardetti Editore, 1954. viii, 501 p.

Seldom have two books offered so nice a contrast: born in the same year, published in the same capital, offering on the same author the maximum discrepancy. On the one hand Machiavelli as Antichrist, on the other as the greatest citizen of Florence after Dante. There can be no room for hesitancy about the choice between them. The book of Prezzolini is, indeed, a curious affair, not one which will arouse respect, or curiosity about its author. Its length would seem to give it a solidity it will be found to lack, its title a direction it will not be found to follow. Sig. Prezzolini is the *lettore avvertito*, looking for venom beneath the surfaces, and often finding it by misrepresentation.

An example of this mine detector working is in his treatment of the sentence: "La quale religione se ne' principi della republica cristiana si fusse mantenuta secondo che dal fondatore d'essa ne fu ordinato, sarebbero gli stati e le republiche cristiane piú unite, piú felici assai, che le non sono" (*Discorsi*, I, xii). From this unpromising material Prezzolini wrests a charge of blasphemy and hedonism (p. 36). In what he says on Spenser the accusation spreads much further. An article of 1909 had stated that in its general scheme the *View of the State of Ireland* "follows the *Prince* very closely," while in *Mother Hubberd's Tale* the Fox has studied Matchavell, and is condemned. So Spenser condemns in public what he advocates in private, and this "condenses the English attitude throughout the centuries," proclaiming honesty and recognizing in practice that to live and prosper dishonesty is needed—archi-Machiavellian by denying in words what deeds were doing (p. 337). So what is archi-Machiavellian is typically English. But there is no resem-

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE · MANHATTAN · LIBRARY · APR 11 1957

blance in general between *Prince* and *View*; and the one reference to a text of Machiavelli in the *View* is an explicit quotation of the *Discorsi* and has no bearing on hypocrisy. Nor will the connection between the *Prince* and *Mother Hubberd* bear examination. Though it is satisfying to write a nation off with one example, it is better if the instance is a valid one.

But how came Spenser in this galley? In the answer lies the explanation of deceptive solidity. Of the 456 pages of Prezzolini's text 200 go to "Il Machiavellismo"; and the section on Machiavelli himself contains 60 for language and precursors (who include Cicero and St. Augustine) and 20 for friends and contemporaries (beginning with Love and ending with Bandello). In this division the doctrines and the works come off poorly: two pages only for the *Discourses upon Livy*, for the keep and citadel of Machiavelli's thought! But Prezzolini has his justification ready; what matters is not what writers thought, but what men have said they thought (p. v). And the first heading of his final section is "il machiavellismo ossia la vera vita di Machiavelli." Here he shows his colors:

"Naturally it will happen to me too to use some times the phrase 'the real Machiavelli,' or to imply it, but it will be a figure of speech. For me, all the interpretations of Machiavelli were right at that given moment ... 'The author did not mean this,' the commentators warn us; and it may be so. But we understand him thus and now his work belongs to us and we have the right (who is to stop us?) to make it say what we can make it say" (p. 268).

That is the forger's license; and in the passage on his own *vie romancée* of Machiavelli (p. 424) we have his confession.

It is this attitude which explains the simplicity of the thesis—what he (who is to stop him?) has made of Machiavelli. And, significantly, the outlines can be culled as easily from the section on Machiavellianism as from the first on Machiavelli. Machiavelli's message is "profoundly pessimistic" (p. 8); the essence of his thought (this is the anthem of the book) is that "tutta la politica è illegittima" (p. 315), whence the "necessity of evil for political action" (p. 148). And Machiavelli would have action to the hilt—would admire G. P. Baglioni had he killed Julius II, but, since he did not, leaves him a vulgar malefactor (p. 378). This also is distortion. The chapter heading (*Discorsi*, I, xxvii) is that men are rarely wholly bad or wholly good; the instance of Baglioni is of one saddled with crimes, but hesitant through spinelessness. The situation is complicated by Machiavelli's disapproval of Julius, by his belief that those who live and reign like him merit the example they allow of. But this does not affect the picture of Baglioni, who is bad, but dare not be so to the uttermost. Only for Prezzolini he is half way to being Machiavelli's hero; and what is most modern in the latter is his advocacy of the "absolute power of the ruler" (p. 279).

It is not unfair to Prezzolini to say that all his picture is in these simplifications, which involve him in some contradictions, and encourage him to some myopia. For instance, on Castiglione, who becomes an anti-Machiavelli because he anticipates the "adoration of rulers" (p. 254). Neither side of the opposition works, and Prezzolini has not rid himself sufficiently of Machiavelli's republicanism. He dismisses the theory of "mixed government" as a verbal homage to tradition (p. 84); though why a scientific realist should pay verbal homage, in the guise of his longest theoretic work, is not explained. Prezzolini sails over such difficulties to a logical extremism. Machiavelli is "Il pensatore più anticristiano del suo tempo"; and it is titles such as this which imply a standpoint we shall not find that Prezzolini takes. Of the legation to Rome in 1503, as Florentine observer of Julius's election, Prezzolini says, Machiavelli "examines the election in a spirit quite divorced from any belief in other than human motives" (p. 214). If there were supernatural elements in Julius's creation, it is legitimate for Prezzolini to write them in; but he is not the only critic to confuse things which are separate. Was Alexander VI right from

his office, or wrong from his conduct? And if you blame the second are you showing disrespect for Christianity? Prezzolini is not the first to wish to have it both ways, in spite of the clarity of Machiavelli's words. "Abbiamo, adunque, con la Chiesa e con i Preti noi Italiani questo primo obligo, di essere diventati sanza religione e cattivi" is the voice of one who attacks the perversion of a thing out of respect for the thing itself; and all those who have seen in such passages disrespect for the Church, then called it an attack on Christianity, have been seeing double.

But that is incidental. The presumption is that whoever writes such a title (*Machiavelli Anticristo*) does so to brand, and to dismiss. But can Prezzolini mean this? At first he hovers, says that men are all afraid of man's condition "whether revealed by Christ or Machiavelli" (p. 4). Two keys to truth? But later, only one, and not the one we thought. "All the utopias written then or that will be written after Machiavelli are in opposition to this thought and bring no progress to our knowledge of man or of politics" (p. 308). As Caesar Borgia is Machiavelli's hero, is not Machiavelli Prezzolini's hero? Machiavelli, we saw, analyzed the conclave which elected Julius, and left no place among the motives for the operation of the Holy Spirit—and seemed accused of an omission. But look to the conclusion of this book, on Machiavelli as our contemporary (pp. 450-456). Here in the modern world (all steeped in Machiavellianism) there is no hint of any factor outside those quoted as the essence of Machiavelli for Prezzolini. And by way of return for the hospitality of America, there comes a wish for its political enlightenment by the adoption of Machiavellianism (p. 456).

By now it is apparent that this is the whole climate of politics. What was English hypocrisy (though archi-Machiavellian practice) stands revealed as the whole wisdom of political man (p. 450). In such a climate Sig. Prezzolini has made full use of his own formula that what you make of an author is what he really is. "Cosí è (se vi pare)." Nor shall we be surprised to find him pinching out the parts which cannot well be reconciled. The *Discorsi* are dealt with in less space than the *Mandragola*. And he revolts against the Biblical fervor of the last chapter of the *Prince* (pp. 245-246). But there are scattered testimonies (rendered unwittingly) that Machiavelli cannot be reduced to scientific realism. The *Art of War* is "the defense of an illusion" (p. 177)—his militia; and on the matter of a militia in Romagna "the good sense of Guicciardini prevailed over the dreams of Niccolò" (p. 234). Giacomini appears as his ideal citizen, an anticipatory Washington, going back to trade from victory (p. 216). Shades of Caesar Borgia! And two pages later —on the first contact with the Germanic world, this cold and scientific Antichrist, who sees all politics as evil, and admires the man who sees this most and says it least, finds his "idealism coagulate" (p. 218) at the sight of unsophisticated mountaineers, fired by their simplicity, their religiosity! The imagination boggles.

In this book it is easier to hunt down Prezzolini than to find Machiavelli. We might take Prezzolini as an accuser of Machiavelli-Anticristo, if throughout the book there were not hints and implications that truth lies only in the message of Machiavelli-Prezzolini. "He was unhappy, as are all men not made drunk or stupid by a *filosofia esaltatrice*" (p. 208). Would Prezzolini wish to be considered drunk or stupid? Then there is the anecdote of the nun, to whom Prezzolini expounded what she took to be the enormities of Machiavelli's thought, and of whose simplicity he makes some fun (p. 339). *Il machiavellismo*—this projection which is the real life of Machiavelli, what Prezzolini makes of him without us being able to stop him—is less what he makes of Machiavelli than what he makes of life. The book leaves him in some danger of the fate of Father Lucchesini, who wrote a famous book—or, since we do not read it, a famous title, *Le Sciocchezze del Machiavelli*, del Padre Lucchesini. By the malice of his bookbinder this passed to currency instead as *Le Sciocchezze del Padre Lucchesini*. It would not be unfitting if the title Prezzolini, *Machiavelli Anticristo*, also suffered syncopation.

If the legend of Matchavell is not quite killed by this reduction to absurdity there remains Ridolfi, who writes, with all the authority his name and scholarship command, a "piana e umana narrazione" of Machiavelli's life, without the *suffumigi* (on fortune and virtue, on politics and humanism...) which have formed the stock in trade of criticism. He has a strong irreverence for the twin authorities, Villari and Tommasini. They may be monumental and fundamental, but Villari begins to speak (a little) of Machiavelli after 300 pages, and both works proceed within masses of adipose tissue. Order and proportion are wanting, and, especially with Tommasini, perspicacious interpretation of the sources (pp. vi-vii). Nor are these merely preliminary remarks, for the acid snubs to Tommasini line the notes to Ridolfi's volume: his inferences are strange, as usual (p. 448); he relies on his imagination, but it lets him down (p. 113). Villari joins Tommasini in wrongness over details, but it is his attitude also that is wrong: "and with Machiavelli he always found himself uneasy" (p. 378).

Villari wrote the lives of Savonarola and Machiavelli, but reserved approval for the first; Ridolfi has written more authoritatively the life of both, but is not so divided. There is warmth in this new attitude, and Machiavelli emerges, like an old master from under dirt and varnish, in more glowing colors. With Michelangelo he is the greatest citizen of Florence after Dante. He is contrasted to Guicciardini: Machiavelli is "theoretic and idealist," Guicciardini "practical and realist" (p. 282). What would Villari have made of such a contrast? Machiavelli is now "il grande appassionato" (p. 364), a poet, not by virtue of his verse, but of his prose. Not only the "alti concetti, ma la poetica solennità" of the final chapter of the *Prince* resounds in the concluding words of the *Discorso per rassettare le cose di Firenze* (p. 276) and in the ending of the *Art of War* (p. 268). In this new atmosphere a welcome emphasis falls on places normally scamped or forgotten. The *Canto degli spiriti beati*, dated for the first time with accuracy, March 1513, appears as the most pious of compositions that pass as *canti carnascialeschi*. Machiavelli has not usually been associated with piety in 1513. The *Esortazione alla Penitenza* is accepted in the "schiettezza" of its statement, and Croce gets an exclamation mark for taking it as a joke (p. 474). The terms of the letter to Guidino arouse the comment: "So wrote to his small son this man who has had the reputation of being bad, cynical, and atheistic" (p. 360). And from the memoirs of Suor Brigida del Paradiso there comes the unexpected story of Machiavelli piously ratifying a donation intended but not willed by his father Bernardo (p. 52).

In all this it will be clear that, to use a phrase of the author's, the prejudices about Machiavelli have been dissipated—so that he appears for the first time in modern Italian criticism with something of the wholesomely heroic stature of a Farinata. The chroniclers of his time had no word for the cassation of a Florentine chancellor in 1512. Why should they?—it was for them a thing of nought. But for Ridolfi, or for us? "Today the fall of Machiavelli seems a bigger thing than the collapse of Florentine liberty" (p. 201). That equates him in magnitude with Dante. And after the "unjust infamy" which has been his lot so long Machiavelli can reappear "grande, appassionato, generoso," to pick three pregnant adjectives from the closing paragraphs.

A wholly different Machiavelli? Not quite. This is a biography, not an account of Machiavelli's thought. That Machiavelli was an idealist, and that his most startling utterances can best be understood on that assumption, is the first and cardinal truth about him. This has not been said so unequivocally before in reputable Italian criticism. But there are echoes still of those who have held authority for Machiavelli: of Croce, in the statement about his syllogisms which are "outside every human or moral consideration" (p. 17); of Toffanin, in the idea that Machiavelli and the *via di mezzo* are incompatible (p. 79). And this, of course, will do as

well for underwriting Chabod; as will the strange passage where Ridolfi sees the new excitement of Machiavelli's style in the passages of the *Istorie Fiorentine* that deal with Gualtieri di Brienne (or with Theodoric) as representing a recurrence of his old "myth of a new prince" (p. 296). I say strange advisedly; for I do not think anyone who turns to that devastating account of the woes of Florence through the tyranny of Gualtieri, with the outspoken speeches against him on a confessedly Machiavellian pattern, and with all the hallmarks of Machiavelli's own vocabulary, can reasonably maintain that Machiavelli's portrait is of a model he admires. There is a similar acceptance of a ready-made view, and in this same context, for Castruccio (p. 272); here the short account is a traditional one, and is already dated.

But if the recent Italian critics (Croce, Toffanin, Chabod, Garin) can be sensed behind these pages, they do not dictate their tone. Here finally, and with impeccable scholarship, the myth of Machiavelli is made untenable in any future work that claims scholarly status. And, significantly, it is the influence of these critics which is the intrusive note, and open to revision. For instance, on that old question why a republican by all conviction wrote the *Prince*—it was because against his heart his prophetic spirit told him that time was marching on to the age of principalities (p. 224). And Ridolfi quotes Toffanin, to conclude: "Only a 'new prince' could now raise these rotten limbs; only in that prince would Lazarus find at least 'uno suo redentore.'" It seems neat, and final; but it would be final only if Machiavelli stopped at that. Then the *Discorsi* would be a discarded fragment, like the *Convivio* after the achievement of the *Comedy*. But they are not; and Machiavelli in 1519-20 proposes still to Leo X a republic, not a monarchy, for Florence; and furbished this again for Giulio de' Medici in 1522—all this upon the evidence of Ridolfi's book. In reality this view of Toffanin belongs to the *suffumigi*, and so does Lazarus and the rotten limbs. "Qui è virtú grande nelle membra, quando la non mancassi ne' capi." For the real corpse of 1513 is the prince himself; and Ridolfi takes for granted (p. 225) that all the conditions for success were there for Lorenzo, except ability. It is just this which his contemporaries could not predetermine, and which the eager idealism of Machiavelli was not ready to suppose.

In so just and generous a book it may be ungracious to suggest, just here and there, a little lingering ungenerosity. How good to see the casual dismissal of the "loving Florence more than one's soul": more fuss for this than a proverbial saying warranted (p. 474). But is there not a defense also for the offending letter of December 8, 1509, which Ridolfi takes as having a basis in fact even if the details are overplayed? Here, just for once, we may look to Prezzolini, who follows the suggestion of Osimo in 1908 that this is nothing but an "invenzione bernesca." And similarly, when Ridolfi writes a caveat at one point in the consistent story of Machiavelli's fervor in activity over his militia, "equanimity" demanding that we should think of pride in an idea, or hope for a career, as motives (p. 135). If men are fervent in a good cause, which they have begotten, we shall do better to be glad than to look askance; and here we may remember—what Ridolfi quotes elsewhere—the words of the good Landucci in his diary: "It was the best thing ever established here in Florence" (p. 134; Landucci, p. 273). And to this we may add also the defense of that militia in the *Art of War* (cf. p. 268), and the correction concerning the minor part it had in the unhappy affair of Prato (cf. p. 428, note 30), and also that piquant discovery—one of these unexpected ones which await the explorer in Machiavellian origins—that Machiavelli had a predecessor of sorts in this recommendation of a militia, in a follower of Savonarola named Domenico Cecchi, in a pamphlet of 1496 entitled *Riforma santa e preziosa per conservazione della città di Firenze*. Presumably, since the pamphlet was not reprinted, the idea seemed, Ridolfi says (p. 122), extravagant. But Machiavelli took it up, made it one of the main planks of his program, not only for Florence but also as a recipe for Clement

VII in the plight of 1525-26. The fate of this idea in that climate is interesting and instructive; Machiavelli fired Clement and his advisers with his enthusiasm, and was sent to Guicciardini in Romagna on the great errand of organizing a new militia. Guicciardini, in his first letter, could not deny the "greatness and nobility" of the idea. But he did not implement it, because the subjects of Romagna were disaffected to the Church; and, in Ridolfi's words, with his "cold and cautious realism" he watered down the "generous idealism" of his friend (p. 321).

In all that story of twenty years' adherence to the idea of a militia as the only genuine basis for making war. there is nothing that does not redound to the credit of Machiavelli; and equanimity might well have led Ridolfi not to question his motives in that first ardor of construction in the Florentine *contado*. This is not the only nuance which still seems unkindly drawn for Machiavelli; and here is one for Francesco Vettori. Perhaps Ridolfi may be right in his analysis (p. 155) of Machiavelli's friend, who never helped him in his hour of need, who read the *Prince* and did not use it to advance the author. Ridolfi's analysis presents Vettori, in a phrase of Guicciardini, as "tutto di sé," and their alliance as *dissimilium societas*. But that is reading everything between the lines to Vettori's disadvantage; yet Ridolfi gives one piece of evidence which shows he may have had no power to restore Niccolò to favor (p. 243). When Paolo Vettori, Francesco's brother, had half-negotiated employment for Machiavelli with Giuliano, Leo's secretary wrote what were the "formal words" of Leo himself: "Although I do not believe it, yet, since there is news of it from Florence, I remind him that this is neither his need, nor ours. This must be an invention of Paulo Vettori . . . write to him from me that I urge him to have nothing to do with Niccolò." "Scrivetegli per mia parte che io lo conforto a non si impacciare con Niccolò." Without the eloquence of the documents, says Ridolfi, it would be difficult to believe so implacable a hatred against the servant of the Florentine republic. Granted; but with them is it not possible to believe that Francesco Vettori may have done his best, in vain?

On a few points of interpretation it is still possible to dissent from this authoritative account of Machiavelli's life. But here, incomparably, is the firmest book on Machiavelli yet to come from Italy—a narration which is "piana e umana," and which is more richly and more solidly based on facts and sources than any of its predecessors. And everywhere we find the warm humanity of Machiavelli, his putting into everything not only the sharpness of his mind, but also "la passione dell'anima" (p. 268).

The book is a constant reminder that there still remains—glanced at and made more soluble here, but not dealt with in its own right—the old problem of Machiavelli's thought. What now, against this demonstration of the humanity of Machiavelli, of that judgment lingering on from Croce and the syllogisms "outside any human or moral consideration"? Is there room for these in this new climate? Is it not rather clear that Ridolfi has inherited, here and there, some pseudo concepts for which, when he (or after him his readers) comes to view Machiavelli as thought, not as biography, there will be no further use? The definitive general study of Machiavelli's thought has not yet been written; but after this definitive biography it can be tackled. And perhaps the epigraph is already here, in a remark of Filippo Strozzi of 1520, when he heard that Machiavelli had been introduced at last to Giulio de' Medici; "Piacemi assai abbiate condotto el Machiavello in casa e' Medici, ché ogni poco di fede acquisti co' padroni, è persona per surgere" (p. 266). "Rarely has an unjust infamy weighed upon a man so long," says Ridolfi in the last paragraph of his book; but now Matchavell is dead, and Machiavelli takes his place.

J. H. WHITFIELD

University of Birmingham

LA GRANDE-BRETAGNE DANS LE ROMAN FRANÇAIS: 1914-1940. By Marius-François Guyard. Paris: Librairie Marcel Didier, 1954. vi, 394 p. (Etudes de Littérature Etrangère et Comparée, Vol. 28.)

Dans cette thèse, Marius-François Guyard reste fidèle à cette conception de la littérature comparée qui prévaut en France et à laquelle s'oppose l'idée américaine d'une telle discipline. Son ouvrage fait le point sur l'image de la Grande-Bretagne telle qu'on la trouve dans les romans français entre les deux guerres. On peut accepter une telle conception, on peut aussi la rejeter; c'est ce que font de ce côté-ci de l'Atlantique René Wellek et son école. D'après ceux-ci, en effet, Monsieur Guyard fait plus figure de sociologue que de professeur de littérature comparée ou de critique littéraire. Et pourtant dans son Avant-Propos, l'auteur prétend avoir voulu rester fidèle à la littérature. C'est là sans doute une distinction subtile et bien arbitraire. Néanmoins, si l'on accepte la conception de la littérature comparée de Monsieur Guyard, son ouvrage nous paraît remarquablement bien documonté, agréable à lire; il apporte de précieux renseignements au lectur et séduit par ses qualités d'honnêteté et d'impartialité. Somme toute, c'est une enquête qu'entreprend Monsieur Guyard dans son livre, enquête qui intéresse ceux qui peuvent en profiter dans leur profession: avant tout, peut-être, les professeurs d'anglais en France qui sont appelés à rectifier devant leurs élèves les images souvent fausses ou fragmentaires que se font les Français de la Grande-Bretagne.

Ceci posé, comment Monsieur Guyard présente-t-il son enquête? Il établit tout d'abord une Géographie littéraire de la Grande-Bretagne. Qui va en Grande-Bretagne? Des enquêteurs comme André Siegfried—des visiteurs: Paul Bourget, Jacques-Emile Blanche, Abel Hermant—des exilés volontaires: Pierre Hamp (un cuisinier plus tard auteur socialiste), Louis Hémon (mort en 1913, mais dont l'œuvre ne sera pas connue avant l'entre-deux-guerres), Paul Morand—des officiers de liaison: Maurois. Quelques grands noms sont attirés par la littérature anglaise: Claudel, Valery Larbaud, Charles du Bos, André Gide.

Où va-t-on en Grande-Bretagne? La curiosité de ces écrivains se concentre à peu près exclusivement sur Londres et les deux grandes universités, Oxford et Cambridge.

D'autre part, Monsieur Guyard examine les Anglais de France: pasteurs, diplomates, écrivains, les "misses," les domestiques, les chorus-girls, les hommes d'affaires, bref toute la gamme des professions prêtes à fournir les clichés sur les Anglais. A cette présence personnelle s'ajoutent les présences littéraires; l'auteur fait surtout une grande part aux revues qui, dans l'entre-deux-guerres, révèlent en France les grands noms de la littérature anglaise.

Monsieur Guyard intitule sa seconde partie "L'Anglais tel qu'on le voit." Les points de vue sont nombreux, mais se ramènent à deux types essentiels: le gentleman (Abel Hermant, André Maurois) qui a ses ennemis (H. Béraud, Céline) et le Yahoo, le prolétaire anglais suivant Dottin (Louis Hémon, Pierre Hamp). Le domaine des mœurs pose une énigme aux témoins français de l'Angleterre: derrière ces jeunes Anglais d'Oxford et de Cambridge, que se cache-t-il? des Hippolyte ou des Corydon? Que sont-ils: puceaux ou pédérastes? Le sexe faible lui-même est-il toujours dépourvu de toute hypocrisie?

Dans une troisième partie, l'auteur passe en revue les opinions des romanciers français sur la politique et la religion anglaises. Là encore, les points de vue reflètent souvent des préjugés tenaces: admirateurs et ennemis s'opposent.

De tout cela, quelques conclusions émergent. Tout d'abord l'image de la Grande-Bretagne entre 1914 et 1940 est anachronique: la plupart des écrivains français qui publient à cette époque montrent une Angleterre victorienne ou édouardienne telle qu'ils l'ont connue dans leur jeunesse, mais qui ne représente plus la nation

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN
KANSAS

anglaise d'après-guerre. L'ouvrage de Jean-Marie Carré sur le mirage allemand avait déjà signalé un phénomène semblable à propos de l'image de l'Allemagne. Ensuite le bilan est assez décevant. Il est dû en partie au fait que peu de grands noms paraissent dans cette enquête. Monsieur Guyard a dû faire appel, faute de mieux, à des écrivains médiocres: Henri Béraud, Abel Hermant. Il est le premier à le regretter. Que retenir alors? "Une dizaine de noms. Cette dizaine, si elle comprenait Gide et Proust, Mauriac et Bernanos, Malraux et Sartre, on l'estimerait justement représentative des générations littéraires qui ont confirmé, conquis ou affirmé leur maîtrise dans les années 1914-1940. Hélas! aucun de ces grands noms ne figure sur notre liste" (p. 350). Bilan négatif donc, auquel arrive Monsieur Guyard. Les romanciers français ne doivent presque rien à l'Angleterre ou bien en donnent une image fragmentaire, renforçant encore les préjugés courants sur l'île et ses habitants. Bilan négatif que Monsieur Guyard s'attendait peut-être à trouver plus riche lorsqu'il entreprit son travail. On imagine difficilement Racine sans la Grèce, dit-il; on peut par contre imaginer Proust et Mauriac sans l'Angleterre. Ce bilan est dû sans doute à l'époque étudiée; au XVIII[e] siècle, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau seraient impensables sans l'Angleterre. On peut et doit regretter si peu de curiosité en France pour les choses anglaises entre les deux guerres, du moins dans la littérature. On peut s'alarmer de voir quelques talents reprendre les clichés et regonfler les mythes, surtout venant d'une nation qui se veut humaniste et qui prêche l'universel. On comprend le manque d'enthousiasme des grands noms devant l'Angleterre entre 1914 et 1940. Si Voltaire et Montesquieu sont impensables sans l'Angleterre, c'est que Swift, Locke et Hume étaient là.

MAURICE A. LECUYER

University of Oregon

UNE IRLANDAISE LIBÉRALE EN FRANCE SOUS LA RESTAURATION, LADY MORGAN. By Marcel Ian Moraud. Paris: Librairie Marcel Didier, 1954. 191 p.

Professor Moraud has added another chapter to the studies of Franco-British literary relationships during the early years of the French Restoration. At the same time, he has presented a new and interesting picture of a personality often mentioned by romantic writers and critics, Stendhal for example, but forgotten today—the Irish novelist and poetess, Lady Morgan (née Sydney Owenson). Before the publication of this book no one had properly evaluated the role of Lady Morgan as a liaison agent between French and British literary and political circles. Never before have the polemics which her hastily written but not mediocre pictures of French society and literature aroused in France and England been presented in a study on this period. The contribution of Lady Morgan to the *bataille romantique* in France is far greater than had ever been suspected. In fact, the echo of Lady Morgan's remarks and judgments can be found in Stendhal's *Racine et Shakespeare.*

Professor Moraud's study is basically chronological in arrangement, beginning with a brief outline of the early years of Sydney Owenson. The thespian life of the novelist's father, Robert Owenson, the slight influence upon the early formation of the novelist's character of her mother's devout Protestantism, the effects upon her character of her mother's early death (1788), and the consequent necessity of placing the two daughters, Sydney and Olivia, in private schools are all recounted in an interesting and concise fashion. Professor Moraud ends this first chapter with a description of the first attempts of young Sydney to earn her own living by her pen, as well as in positions as private tutor to the children of well-

to-do and titled families. This early introduction to the aristocratic society of both Ireland and England had a profound influence upon the later *bas bleu* of European society.

In the second and third chapters ("Premiers contacts avec la France," and "Poésies et premiers romans"), Professor Moraud traces the novelist's predilection for things French from its earliest manifestations: in the private school operated by Mme Terson, in the relationship of her father with the "Ffrenches de Bordeaux," a wine-exporting firm for which he acted as agent in Ireland, and especially in the association with their maid Molly, a descendant of the French Huguenots who found asylum in Ireland and a woman who in many respects replaced Mrs. Owenson in the affection of the children after the mother's death. The third chapter gives a very brief account of Sydney's early novels. Wherever possible, Professor Moraud has pointed out French influences in these works: *Saint Clair* shows decided influence of *La Nouvelle Héloïse* and of *Paul et Virginie; The Novice of Saint Dominick* is compared briefly with the novels of Mme de Staël; *Ida of Athens* is placed among the early feminist novels of the nineteenth century. He concludes: "Le fait qu'il convient toutefois de noter est ce retour de la jeune romancière vers des sujets, des idées, et des modèles français, et d'une façon générale vers cette France avec laquelle elle n'avait pas alors pris directement contact et qui reparait encore dans les innombrables citations françaises dont elle ne cesse d'émailler ses écrits" (p. 58).

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 reproduce in an organized fashion the various opinions expressed by Lady Morgan at the time of her first visit to France and recorded in her two-volume book, *France* (1817). Chap. 4 ("La France, 1817") is devoted to the first of these volumes, in which Lady Morgan gives a very favorable picture of the French peasants. Professor Moraud is careful to point out that she arrived in France with a prejudiced view concerning the abuses of the *ancien régime*. Indeed, she disliked, as did all patriotic Irishmen, any dominant government other than a people's government. This distorted opinion of prerevolutionary France encourages a very flattering view of the newly liberated and morally rejuvenated peasant as she found him in 1815-16, a change for the better which she attributes to the Revolution rather than to Napoleon's internal reforms or to the scientific and economic progress attained "sous la double pression du blocus et de la guerre" (p. 64). Professor Moraud criticizes these "explications plutôt simplistes," but points out that her description of the French people is vastly superior in scope and detail to that of Birkbeck, whose *Notes on a Journey through France* had been published two years earlier.

In Chap. 5 ("Paris—son atmosphère—le peuple de Paris"), Professor Moraud presents Lady Morgan's first impressions of Paris, including her opinion that in the main the architecture to be seen in Paris is greatly inferior to that of England. She delighted in the numerous gardens and public parks of Paris. What interested her most, however, were the crowds to be seen on the streets of Paris, crowds made up of happy and busy people who showed none of the sinister qualities usually attributed to Frenchmen by the English of that time. Professor Moraud traces her liberal attitude towards novel French customs to Montesquieu's theories concerning the effects of climate, geographical location, etc., upon the character of different nations.

Chap. 6 ("La Sociéte française à Paris en 1816-17") presents the opinions of Lady Morgan concerning French society and French literature as they are to be found in *France*. Professor Moraud briefly outlines her picture of the evolution of French society, but devotes the greater portion of this chapter to her remarks concerning the *ancien régime*, the royalist and ultraroyalist parties in 1816, and the liberal or "constitutional" party of the period. He emphasizes the

fact that Lady Morgan arrived in France at a moment when partisans of every conceivable political party could be met and heard. Her reactions, however, are determined by her prejudices against the royalist parties. But this bias does not prevent her from giving valuable accounts of her meetings with various people of political importance. Professor Moraud points out that a critic who is willing to disregard the innumerable pages of "bavardage mondain" to be found in this book will be rewarded with "des tableaux parfois très vivants et très pittoresques."

Lady Morgan's value as a literary critic appears to Professor Moraud to be practically nil. Being a foreigner and not particularly skilled in the French language, she was unable to appreciate the true value of contemporary writers (her low opinion of Chateaubriand is presented at length); and, being an ardent opponent of everything pertaining to the *ancien régime*, she was totally blind to the beauties of classical French literature. Her scathing criticisms of Racine brought upon her the denunciation of the aristocratic and royalist dignitaries whose hospitality she had enjoyed, as well as the approval of the enemies of classicism. The reaction of critics to her book is described in Chap. 7 ("L'Accueil fait à *La France* de Lady Morgan"), including the criticisms of Defauconpret, who undertook to translate the work into French, and of Charles Dupin, who published a brochure of 140 pages, *Lettre à Lady Morgan sur Racine et Shakespeare* (1818), in which is to be found "une des réfutations les plus savantes et les plus efficaces des critiques, tant anglaises que françaises" (p. 130), of Lady Morgan. Other writers who replied to Lady Morgan's attack upon the *ancien régime* and classicism, are cited, including writers in royalist periodicals and the proroyalist Englishman William Playfair (*France as it is, not Lady Morgan's France*, 1821). The historical importance of Lady Morgan's book is that it helped to crystallize the attitudes of the two schools of critics in France and to introduce revolutionary literary theories (which would soon impassion the romantics) to a much wider reading public than had hitherto been exposed to them.

In the remaining two chapters of his study, Professor Moraud takes up in turn the *Passages from my Autobiography* (1859), in which is to be found an account (hitherto overlooked by the critics) of lady Morgan's second sojourn in France (1818-19), and *France in 1829-30* (1830)—tracing her impressions of French society, politics, literature, etc. during these last two visits. Her welcome by the French was somewhat less unanimous than in 1816, yet during both visits she enjoyed the intimate society of the French intelligentsia to a greater degree than perhaps any other English visitor at the time, and her vivid first-hand report is of great interest to the student of this period.

In the field of literary criticism, Lady Morgan again reveals her singular inability to comprehend French literary movements. Her complete denunciation of French classicism is complemented in these two later works by a superficial yet scathing denunciation of French romanticism. Her attitude towards the new school completely mystified the young romantics who had hailed her in 1817 as one of their own. Lady Morgan was aware of her rather unique position: "Je deviens l'écrivain paria du classicisme... et ce fut ainsi que je devins le martyr du romantisme avant de m'être rendu compte de son existence" (cited in translation, p. 174). In this respect, she was considerably behind the more liberal English reviews (*Literary Gazette, New Monthly Magazine*, and *Edinburgh Review*), which since 1823 had recognized the literary value of the French romanticists. Her inability to appreciate French romanticism sprang, as she herself admitted, from her superficial knowledge of it. Her acquaintance seems to have been limited to a few poems which emphasize the sickly and morbid aspects of romantic poetry (p. 183).

Despite Professor Moraud's attempt to excuse this attitude ("elle était in-

capable de s'asseoir paisiblement, un livre de poésie en mains, et de lui consacrer le temps voulu."—p. 183), her refusal to re-evaluate French romanticism demonstrates again the lack of literary insight of a mind full of prejudices and preconceived ideas. When faced with the necessity of appraising French romanticism, she can merely say, and grudgingly at that, that it had "libéré l'époque moderne de la décrépitude et de la médiocrité de l'âge qui a précédé" (cited, p. 184). This shortcoming, however, does not destroy the true value of her works, which was that, "ayant épousé la cause du libéralisme français, elle le défend à tout heure, en tout lieu, en France aussi bien qu'en Angleterre, et cela par tous les moyens, les siens propres, et ceux que mettaient à sa disposition ses amis français" (p. 11). In doing this, Lady Morgan rendered an invaluable service in the restoration of better Anglo-French understanding at a time when this was desperately needed. Professor Moraud's study is of great value in bringing to light the opinions of this literary personality, whose books offer a delightful source of information on an extremely rich and complex period in French literary history.

ROBERT L. MYERS

Rice Institute

JEAN-PIERRE DE CROUSAZ (1663-1750) ET LE CONFLIT DES IDÉES AU SIÈCLE DES LUMIÈRES. By Jacqueline E. de La Harpe. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955. 281 p.

In most surveys of eighteenth-century French literature Jean-Pierre de Crousaz has remained a landmark viewed at a distance. A Swiss polygraph from the Pays de Vaud, he has owed what little recognition literary historians have accorded him to introductions briefly made at crossroads of the great. Diderot recommended his *Logic* to the Empress Catherine, and criticized his aesthetics. Rousseau referred to him as "le pédant de Crousaz" and found his refutation of Pope boring. Mme du Châtelet wrote that "il radote absolument," and Voltaire, while treating him gallantly as the illustrious M. de Crousaz who had criticized Pope's optimism, characterized him for history as "le philosophe le moins philosophe et le bavard le plus bavard des Allemands." French literary historians seldom mention his name, and the Swiss themselves have found it difficult to discover in him either profundity of mind or grace of style. As a philosopher in the freethinking Age of Reason, the best that has been thought of him is that his intellectual growth was outdistanced by history.

Professor de La Harpe's study of Crousaz is a contribution of first importance to the meager fund of information hitherto accessible concerning the philosopher and professor of the Academy of Lausanne. The story she relates is not marginal but central to the intellectual history of an age; it is the story in concrete terms of the decline of the Cartesian epoch in Europe. Based on a large collection of documents, papers, and letters held by the Crousaz family, together with materials found in various libraries throughout Europe, Miss de La Harpe's study is concerned with Crousaz the correspondent, and from this vantage point with his role in the conflict of ideas in the Age of Enlightenment.

While the general facts of Crousaz' life have been known, the substance Miss de La Harpe adds to them is appreciable. Her study presents him not only as professor of the Academy of Lausanne, where as a student he had taught himself geometry and mathematics and read Descartes in secret, but as philosopher, writer, and correspondent as well. It follows his public career as rector of the Academy during the dark days of the *Consensus*, exhorting his faculty to render to the authorities at Bern the things they were requiring in the name of more august authority. And it

shows him as a close observer in the affair of Major Davel, the Jeanne d'Arc of Lausanne, who with dignity and heroism paid the ultimate penalty for redressing the decent conscience of the Pays de Vaud.

Miss de La Harpe is at her best in recounting the capitulation of the Academy and the Davel incident; her account is above reproach both for its fairness to Crousaz and for its respect for the opinion of history. Without condoning Crousaz' public conduct as rector of the great Academy, she does full justice to the personal integrity and unselfish motives which lay behind it. To Crousaz the issue was indeed an issue of freedom of conscience and of the freedom of the Academy, for which as an individual he had stood firm. But now, as rector, with sincere concern for the future careers of nonsigners, he was convinced that obedience was imperative. In the Davel case, Miss de La Harpe shows Crousaz once more in the throes of divided loyalties. Davel's act of open sedition, he feared, would invite serious reprisals, and possibly plunge the whole Pays de Vaud into civil war. For reasons of principle, therefore, he approved the action of his nephews, the civil magistrates, who betrayed Davel to the Bern authorities. Yet here again Miss de La Harpe shows that, for all his philosophic objections to Davel's "fanatisme," Crousaz' respect for constituted authority did not prevent him from admiring the noble and heroic character of Davel the man. Her narrative resumes with Crousaz' departure from Lausanne a year later to accept a professorship at the Univesity of Groningen. After eighteen months of strained relations with his new colleagues, he leaves Groningen for Cassel, where he is governor and preceptor of the crown prince of Hesse, goes on to Geneva, and eventually back again to Lausanne. During the last years of his life we see him endeavoring to restore the Academy to its former position of eminence, and deeply engaged in his "religious war," as he called it, with Leibniz and with Pope.

In the analysis of the correspondence, which comprises Part II of her study, Miss de La Harpe is nothing if not thorough. She explains the realities of the European postal service in the eighteenth century, examines Crousaz' epistolary relationship with each of his correspondents, and enumerates subjects dealt with as well as subjects omitted. In Part III, intitled "L'Œuvre et l'Homme," she reviews his accomplishments in the many domains of knowledge to which he contributed; her assessment of Crousaz the thinker constitutes an important modification of the traditional view of him as a rigid and intransigent conservative. Despite Diderot's and Buffier's criticism, she holds that the *Logique*, though of Cartesian inspiration, also reveals strong evidence of the influence of Locke. The *Traité du Beau*, she declares, was an original work for its time, antedating as it does the more widely known works on aesthetics of Du Bos, André, Batteux, Diderot, and others. In the domain of education Crousaz' efforts were again mainly but not exclusively in the Cartesian tradition of his age. Denouncing scholastic generalities, abstruse distinctions, and complexities of all kinds, he wished to teach the child clarity through mathematics, and to teach him to reason through study of the sciences. But finally, as Rousseau observed in the *Emile*, Crousaz also insisted with the wise Locke that the child be regarded as a body as well as a mind to be exercised and trained.

As a polemicist, Crousaz is shown defending the hard-won ground of the early period of Cartesianism, which had begun as an age both of faith and of science and refused to regard itself as a provisional transition between scholastic dogmatism and philosophic incredulity. Crousaz was disturbed by the philosophic libertinism of Collins' treatise on the freedom of thought. He was convinced that in Pierre Bayle were to be seen all the manifestations of the growing threat to religion. And in Pope and Leibniz, whose views on Providence seemed to him to eliminate the freedom of the will, he saw the destruction of all morality. In the field of scientific thought Miss de La Harpe finds Crousaz less intractable than appears from his

early Cartesian discourses. The evidence she adduces of his conversion to Newtonian physics at the age of 78 is an indication that he was at least less adamant in matters of science than in matters of faith.

In addition to the laborious needlework required to make a *Life* out of Crousaz' letters, Professor de La Harpe has performed a prodigious task of exposition of both the man and his work. She has done considerably more than she promised, for she is indeed as much concerned with Crousaz the thinker as with Crousaz the correspondent. Whether she has changed very much the place traditionally allotted to him in literary history remains to be determined by future literary historians; but in any case the dimension she has added to our present knowledge broadens the basis on which he must be judged. By placing him in clearer historical perspective, she has unquestionably given respect if not lustre to his reputation. Nevertheless her study is by no means an *apologia*. Crousaz' role in the troubles of the *Consensus* was not heroic, and Miss de La Harpe does not make it so. If he fancied himself a citizen of the world by reason of his wide friendships with the world's great, she makes it clear that he was somewhat less than cosmopolitan in his exaggerated respect for constituted authority even when it was despotic and provincial. For all Crousaz' polygraphic activity, he eschewed the study of political philosophy as the epitome of uselessness. He had the intellectual commitments of a provincial aristocrat proud of his ancestry, avid of recognition by the great, and fearful of incurring their displeasure. As a thinker he was neither exceptionally profound nor exceptionally original; and, once the eigtheenth century began to declare itself, he found himself completely out of sympathy with its break with tradition in general and with its announced directions in particular.

Yet, if it is remembered that Crousaz lived almost as long as Fontenelle, it is scarcely to be expected that he should change as rapidly as the age; and, if he has not been included in the traditional curricula of eighteenth-century studies, the reasons are to be sought, as Miss de La Harpe's study suggests, in considerations which concern not only the history of philosophy but also the nature of literature. It is clear that Crousaz outlived his age, and that the age which followed did not regard with reverence the faith of its fathers. But this fact alone is not of paramount importance, because the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries continued to read others whose opinions they did not share. Writers with no more substantial intellectual baggage than his have made longer voyages through history than he. In the end it must be recognized that Crousaz was above all a professor of the Academy of Lausanne, and that, as the eighteenth century attested with uncommon uniformity, his literary style was wretched. As a writer, he bore what Rossel called the unmistakable mark of the Refuge, and in all probability is destined to remain, if not Voltaire's "bavard le plus bavard des Allemands," the academician of France's asylum and outpost in the Pays de Vaud.

A debt of gratitude is owed by all eighteenth-century scholars to Mlle Berthe de Crousaz for releasing the family's literary treasure to the public domain. It should be gratifying to her to know that her illustrious forbear has been presented to history with fairness, sympathy, and skill.

LELAND THIELEMANN

University of California, Los Angeles

STUDIEN ZUR AUFFASSUNG DES NORDISCHEN IN DER GOETHEZEIT. By Horst Oppel. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1944. 243 p.

Professor Oppel has held the chair of English in Mainz ever since the new university was founded in 1946. His publications have frequently exceeded the sphere of *Anglistik* and embraced German and Scandinavian literatures as well. This has

enabled him to enter the field of comparative literature, to which his most recent contribution has been "Der Einfluß der englischen Literatur auf die deutsche" in Stammler's *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß* (Berlin, 1954) III, 47-144. The book under review had an even wider purpose. It was written sixteen years ago and published at the end of the war, but still deserves attention for many reasons.

One of these is the peculiar connotation and a specific emotional appeal which the term "nordisch" assumed during the period of National Socialist domination over Germany. Professor Oppel tried to give some measure of balance to this term in a preliminary study of his book entitled "Von den Aufgaben einer deutsch-nordischen Literaturbetrachtung."[1] He there pointed out the fact that the term "nordisch" had been arbitrarily tossed about between "ungebührliche Ausweitung" and "verkrampfte Verengung," and insisted on giving the "southern" point of view its rightful place in the history of ideas. According to his definition it is the privilege of "southern man" "in frommem Beharren und stiller Dienstbarkeit die Einheit und Ganzheit des Menschlichen zu verkünden," whereas "northern man" is prepared "der Versöhnung der Gegensätze zu entsagen in der tragisch aufgegipfelten Entscheidung."[2]

However dangerous and, in the last resort, meaningless such formulations (the result of a barrage of existentialist verbiage) may be, they enabled Professor Oppel to throw new light upon Goethe and to survey his work from a new angle. Broadly speaking it is the author's aim to show in Goethe the confluence of the antithetical modes of thinking and feeling of the "North" and of the "South," his grappling—in the critical works—with the influences of the North when they crossed his way, and the unconscious absorption of Nordic elements in his creative work even after he had turned away from the basically Nordic attitude to life of his Sturm und Drang years. Oppel pursues the thesis that in the "German soul" the northern and southern forces are in constant conflict, that they meet on German soil and wrestle with one another, and that this struggle had found in Goethe an exemplary battlefield.

The essence of the "German Nordic idea" is according to Oppel—at least at the time he wrote his book—that in it "all the forces of the mind and all the powers of the soul converge" (p. vii). This seems to contradict the earlier formulation which gives the "southern" idea its peculiar characteristic qualities; and in many respects the book contains a goodly number of contradictions. The danger of these confrontations is, in any case, that they lead to oversimplifications. Two points have to be contested in particular: that only the "Nordic" mode of viewing life and the universe possesses the "unconscious" and "subconscious" qualities, the irrational and elemental impetus, for creative artistic and imaginative activities; and that "basic values" (*Urwerte*) such as "honor, freedom, love, hatred" and "other great passions" are exclusively Germanic values. Incidentally, should "hatred" really be considered an *Urwert?* All this is not to say that there are no basic differences between "North" and "South"; there are, just as there exist polar dissimilarities between "East" and "West" (but where are the delineations between these two axes?).

Definitions of the "northern" and "southern" ways seem to be abstractions whose elements are to be found among all peoples in one way or other at different times. How can anyone be sure whether this German view of the *Nord-Idee* or the *Nord-Gedanke* is borne out by the Nordic people themselves? Oppel's pages on Adam Oehlenschläger—the "standard bearer of Nordic Renaissance" (the inaugurator of the romantic school in Denmark would be a more precise definition)—seem to increase those doubts. Oehlenschläger, according to Oppel, fell a victim to

[1] In *Dichtung und Volkstum* (*Euphorion*), XXXVIII (1937), 494-505.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 505.

Weimar, which diverted his natural inclinations; he even betrayed the "ethos of his Nordic past," and the ideal of humanity "decomposed" the "nordische Altertumsschau" of his drama *Palnatoke* (pp. 68 ff.); and Hendrik Steffens, another important mediator between the North and Germany, although born in Stavanger, is highly suspect because his racial origin (*blutsmäßige Zugehörigkeit*) is under a cloud; his grandmother was a Latin-American Creole (p. 92).

Notwithstanding these lapses into National Socialist idiosyncrasy, ideology, and terminology and a style all too frequently overlaid by the wafting swathes of a northern fog, Professor Oppel's book is of great value in its narrative, in its detailed observations, in its broad and often profound surveys of literary currents, and in its analyses of Goethe's mind and work. The first two chapters survey the discovery of the North by Justus Möser, Klopstock, Herder, and the Sturm und Drang Goethe, each in his own individual way—Möser appearing as the most genuine and undiluted worshipper of the Nordic mode of life, Klopstock as a sentimentalist, and Herder as a complex figure who reconciled the Nordic way with Christianity.

The third chapter deals with Goethe's "iphigenische Wendung" and examines in detail his turning away from the tragic view of life to an integration of personality and world in apostasy from Möser and in contrast to Herder's later ideal of humanity. The antithetical attitude which by now has opened a chasm between Goethe and the Nordic world is developed in chapters IV-VI and demonstrated in Goethe's particular kind of symbolism (Chapter IV), his cool reception of the Nordic Renaissance after 1800 (V), and his full acceptance of a classical attitude in form and content (VI), in which Schiller played an important part. The chapter on "Klassik and Romantik" (VII) can well be compared with Fritz Strich's well-known book (which is not mentioned). It throws many interesting sidelights on the ambivalence of these terms. This and other chapters demonstrate how chequered and manifold the cross-currents were, and how many different issues directed the stream of intellectual events, so much so that neither Strich's sweeping psychological confrontations, nor Kindermann's perception of a "Deutsche Bewegung" as a unifying force, nor an all-pervading "spirit" of the *Goethezeit* as visualized by Korff, remain valid for this age.

In his last chapter, "Von der 'Iphigenie' zum 'Faust,'" Oppel sees the Nordic idea seep back into Goethe's later thinking, feeling, and creative work, although he admits that this was an unconscious process. There is no doubt that Goethe saw himself face to face with the Nordic world once more. His sympathy for the Germanic past was revived (cf. his utterances concerning the *Nibelungenlied*, the *Wunderhorn* collection, Grimm's Old Danish ballads, the *Edda* translation, and his interest in mediaeval art aroused by Boisserée) although it remained antiquarian. The nature of the demonic occupied his mind increasingly. In *Faust* itself the descent to the Mothers, the magic battle, and the Philemon-Baucis scenes arrest Oppel's attention as expressions of the demonic.

The parallels with the *Edda* and with Norse sagas which Oppel draws are very illuminating; however, doubts arise as to whether Goethe really drew his new symbolism from this world, whether he really was imbued with the Nordic "Nebelwelt" (did it not rather serve as a foil?), whether he really threw off the "ensnaring spell of Winkelmann's Hellenism" on completion of the Helena scenes (p. 209). Does *Faust* II really represent "im unlöslichen Durchwirktsein des Tragischen mit dem Dämonischen die grossartige Altersform seines Menschenbildes" (p. 215)? Viewing the tragedy in this context, Oppel is unable to disentangle the incongruity of Faust's final ascension into the Christian Heaven.

Oppel's reclamation of the old Goethe for the *Nord-Idee* does not seem to have been successful; the identification of the demonic with the inexorably tragic atti-

tude of the sagas is by no means convincing. There is no doubt of Oppel's admiration for and penetrating knowledge of Goethe's work and world. But he does not remain consistent in his aims. He promises in his introduction to describe how Goethe found a way out of the polarity between North and South, and redeemed human exposure to guilt and sin by the totality of our existence whose symbolism has its roots in the Nordic heritage. (p. 8). But on the last page of his book Oppel turns his allegiance to the "extraclassical" writers of the age of Goethe, to Jean Paul, Hölderlin, and Kleist, who, he claims, although denied access to Weimar, succeeded, evidently more truly than Goethe, in reconciling the opposing forces. Their achievements, Oppel says, were "casts into the future," because in them "the coming contingencies of life for our people were anticipated and precreated" (p. 240). This seems a bewildering contradiction.

But it should be stressed again that Oppel's book is stimulating in many respects. For the historian of comparative literature it contains a wealth of information on the interrelations between German and Scandinavian literatures in the age of Goethe; and the study of Goethe's relationship to the North is a valuable, if debatable, contribution to our insight into his development.

RICHARD SAMUEL

University of Melbourne

THE GREAT RIMBAUD FORGERY. THE AFFAIR OF LA CHASSE SPIRITUELLE, WITH UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS AND AN ANTHOLOGY OF RIMBALDIAN PASTICHES. By Bruce Morrissette. Saint Louis: Washington University, 1956. viii, 333 p.

In May 1949 there was launched in Paris what was to become probably the greatest literary scandal of the century, the publication of a forged text of Rimbaud's long-lost *Chasse spirituelle*. The text was, in fact, a deliberate hoax intended to bring ridicule upon some of those who accepted it as genuine; but it was never part of the plot that the text should be so fully accepted that it would be printed and given to the public as genuine. Hence, when it did appear, its authors, Nicolas Bataille and Mlle Akakia-Viala, at once admitted their authorship and denounced the work as a forgery—only to find to their horror that they had succeeded so well that some of those responsible for publication were loath to admit they had been fooled.

A battle of authorship ensued, and dispute raged in the press, on the radio, and in private meetings. During the heat of the argument in the first few days, and over the months which succeeded, innumerable critics took sides and offered reasons for their stands. Interestingly enough, although it was rapidly apparent that the work was really a forgery, and although most of the ink was spent in showing how obvious it was, it is also true that most of the proofs collapse on close investigation! And so what was originally a complex problem in literary history became also a complex proving ground for critics and for critical methods. This is the intertwined maze of material which Professor Bruce Morrissette has undertaken to clarify in his book.

This study is an unqualified success. It opens with an account of earlier Rimbaud forgeries, which set the stage for the current one. A second chapter lists and evaluates all that is known of the lost *Chasse spirituelle*, whose title alone has come down to us. Two further chapters examine the more important of the over two hundred titles which have been published in connection with the *Affaire*; these chapters alone would suffice to make this a valuable addition to Rimbaud studies.

The last two chapters undertake to establish with precision the nature of the critical problem of the false *Chasse*, to resolve it accurately, and to elucidate its

importance as a lesson for criticism. The lesson is incisively delineated and is of major importance. Some few critics were taken in; they should not have been. Innumerable other critics, knowing that the work was a forgery, proclaimed it one for reasons which will not withstand critical examination. What is the moral? There are actually several.

A first one is fairly obvious to the scholarly critic, but it is still pleasant to have it demonstrated so clearly: the glib reviewers in the popular press, so full of self-importance, of pontifications, and of contempt for scholarship, tumble headlong into the dust under Professor Morrissette's scrutiny. Their approach was, as always, dogmatic, absolute, and "intuitive," but their intuitions led them to make idiotic remarks about Rimbaud—generalities which were meaningless or specific statements which were inaccurate.

This much it is pleasant to see proved; the rest is more delicate and perhaps even more useful. For Professor Morrissette examines also those critics who made close analyses, who studied the constructions closely and sought by means of internal evidence of a scholarly type to demonstrate that Rimbaud could not have put the piece together. Alas, here too grievous errors were committed and asseverations were made which simply will not concord with facts readily ascertainable from the known Rimbaud texts. This raises a problem nearer to home for the scholarly critic: Is it impossible for a scholarly method, given the fact that this is a forgery, to demonstrate that it is so with acceptable proofs? It is comforting to see Professor Morrissette attack the problem, finally, himself; for by using really acceptable scholarly criteria instead of shoddy imitations of the method, he has little difficulty in proving his case.

The key to Professor Morrissette's success is rather simple and somewhat old-fashioned—really adequate documentation. It is good, and clearly useful, to see its values reaffirmed. The scholarly method in literary criticism, whatever its particular subject and whatever its special techniques may be, rests ultimately on the making of only verified and verifiable assertions. Had Morrissette's predecessors, learned or semi-learned, been forced to prepare and present the sort of documentation which he presents, they could not have made their errors—for the flaws would have been as apparent to these writers as they became to Morrissette when he sought to document them. The method loses nothing, moreover, for being clothed in the pleasant, informal tone of this book, whose scholarly apparatus is impeccable but never obtrusive.

B. F. Bart

Syracuse University

German Proverbs. By Edmund P. Kremer. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1954. 115 p.

This is a collection of 1380 German proverbs in common use since the turn of the century, with their parallels in English.

The author properly calls attention in his Introduction to the unsettled conditions that have prevailed in Germany since World War II. "Individuals and families are constantly drifting from behind the iron curtain into West Germany ... The result is a never-ending struggle of unpopular newcomers with the luckier old-timers, and a consequent disrupting effect upon the people and their minds. Like the people themselves, their language is also in a state of flux, so rapid and so constant that even a native Germanist cannot be present in all of these situations or keep up with the changes."

All the more reason for such a collection as this at the present time. The dif-

ficulty of the task makes it a more rewarding labor. The choosing of an English proverb to fit the German presents a major problem. Sometimes the choice is inevitable, as with: "Eile mit Weile"; "Wie gewonnen, So zerronnen"; "Allzu viel ist ungesund"; etc. But in most cases some search is necessary to find the best parallel in English, and in a number of instances no suitable proverb in English can be found.

The chief difficulty in fitting a suitable parallel to a list of proverbs of present-day Germany (first half of this century) lies in the fact that we do not have a sufficiently comprehensive collection of our own contemporary proverbs. The author has had recourse to current American versions. Much has been done in some states toward both collecting and publishing. Professor Margaret Bryant, who is in general charge of this task of collecting, reports uneven progress over the nation. She makes special mention of the advances made by Professor Archer Taylor, who has edited the collections of Weyland D. Hand and Emelyn E. Gardner, a work in preparation by Professor G. O. Arlt—all in California—Professor Marjorie Kimmerle, working under a grant from the University of Colorado, and Professor Muriel Hughes in Vermont. Editors, she reports, are needed everywhere.

If and when this national collection is published, it will be much easier to find suitable comparisons for foreign proverbs.

Here are a few suggestions of proverbs that are probably of more general use than the one given. The first is the author's choice, the second is the suggestion.

Das Huhn legt gern ins Nest, darin schon Eier sind.
"Money attracts money."
"Nothing succeeds like success."

Die Rut' macht gut.
"You've got to hammer iron before it makes good steel."
"Spare the rod and spoil the child."

Rast' ich, so rost' ich, sagt der Schlüssel.
"Use or lose."
"The used key is always bright." [In the farm belt it is "the used plow."]

These suggestions are made to illustrate the embarrassment of wealth which must have often confronted the author, who has given us excellent counterparts for these well-chosen German proverbs in common daily use. His book is a valuable companion for the student of German, well illustrating differences in idiom between the languages in a compact, pithy sentence, easy to remember. He also furnishes those of the public who already know some German with a charming *livre de chevet.*

FRANCIS W. BRADLEY

University of South Carolina

ICON AND IDEA. THE FUNCTION OF ART IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS. By Herbert Read. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955. 161 p. 88 pl.

Speculation on the nature and function of art is one of the major preoccupations of our day. It is often undertaken on a philosophical basis and without reference to practice; at times the opposite limitation hinders the writer—his knowledge of art is not accompanied by a thorough understanding of metaphysical and epistemological problems. But in Sir Herbert Read's *Icon and Idea* we find the unusual combination of a keen appreciation of art in all its forms and its

AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN
STATE COLLEGE - KANSAS

tory and a systematic knowledge of philosophy. The result is one of the most important works of speculation on the nature and function of art in these days.

"A somewhat revolutionary theory of art" (p. 5) is presented carefully in a documented survey of the "correspondence between the main epochs of art and an expanding awareness of the nature of reality" (p. 19). Art is considered "the essential instrument in the development of human consciousness" (p. 17), following the intuitions of Conrad Fiedler and the conclusions of the recent philosophy of Ernst Cassirer. To accept this theory and its implications, we must believe that "before the word was the image, and the first attempts of man to define the real are pictorial attempts, images scratched or pecked or painted on the surfaces of rocks or caves" (p. 20). Here, of course, lies the point of contention. It is not proved that the image was before the word. We do not know. Besides, a theory of art that considers the image as the basic unit of art is debatable, particularly if it does not explain the specific difference between art, as a form of thought, and other forms of thought which in their turn are also developed from the image.

But once we accept the premises, we are led into a fascinating exploration of prehistoric art. Since the problem of what function cave painting and drawing served in prehistoric society has been dealt with at length by the same author in *Art and Society* (New York, 1937), we are willing to keep the problem in abeyance and accept the term "art"—with its modern connotations—to designate an activity that might have had another meaning. The principles underlying Palaeolithic and Neolithic art are defined as "vitalism" and "beauty," respectively, and the passage from one to another explained as an expansion of consciousness. When these poles of thinking are fixed, Herbert Read continues his voyage into historic art in Europe and, incidentally, in Asia. The assertion that mediaeval art ended in "a mannered manipulation of forms that had become clichés of design" (p. 92) may need some correction in the light of Ernst R. Curtius' detailed study of mannerism and clichés in the Middle Ages in *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (New York, 1953).

Perhaps the most suggestive considerations of the book, however, are not historical, but rather—and humbly so—prophetical. In his discussion of contemporary art, Herbert Read points to a possible future that is indeed difficult to imagine, although greatly tempting. "The future scale of the artist is not domestic, nor even monumental, but environmental: the artist of the future will not be a painter or a sculptor or an architect, but a new molder of plastic forms who will be painter and sculptor and architect in one—not an adulterous mixture of all these talents, but a new kind of talent that subsumes and supersedes them all" (p. 133).

Consequences of these theories and new perceptions of and in the history of art are varied and belong to every field of human activity. But none of them can be of greater importance than the effect which our awareness of art and its function in the development of human consciousness could have on education. The author touches upon this point (p. 139) and reminds us of his plea for *Education through Art* (New York, 1945), a book that renewed, at a distance of twenty-five centuries, Plato's contention about the central function of art in education.

Icon and Idea, in the narrow confines of its seven chapters (originally seven lectures), deals with almost every problem in the history of art and in the field of aesthetics; it clarifies many of them and suggests new problems and new solutions. At times abstruse or unexplained words—numinous, eidetic, haptic, tactiform, ideoplastic, expressionistic, empathy—and a reliance on such concepts as "the unconscious" and "instinct" tend to irritate the reader by what Cassirer would call "replacing an unknown with an unknown." Yet this book by a mature student of the arts, poetry, and philosophy, in its wise synthesis, comes to re-

affirm our faith in the human mind and in art as a form of thought, as an activity "on the basis [of which] ... a 'symbolic discourse' becomes possible, and religion, philosophy, and science follow as consequent modes of thought" (p. 19). "It is an immensely presumptuous claim," adds Sir Herbert Read, and we are most happy to hear it voiced, especially in such a handsomely presented volume.

BERNARD GICOVATE

Tulane University

ISTORIYA UKRAYINSKOYI LITERATURY VID POCHATKIV DO DOBY REALIZMU. (History of Ukrainian Literature from its Origin to the Realistic Period.) By Dmytro Čiževsky. New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1956. 511 p.

This volume, published by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. and the Shevchenko Scientific Society, with the aid of the East European Fund, is one of the most important of the series of Ukrainian volumes appearing under these auspices. It deserves to be in every library of Slavic materials; for it is by far the best history of Ukrainian literature that has thus far appeared and is almost the only book that treats the literature with due appreciation of its artistic and literary values. In this it differs from most of its predecessors, which have stressed instead the sociological and historical aspects of the works with scant regard for their literary merit.

The book is marked throughout by sanity and careful scholarship. In dealing with the oldest period and with the pagan origin of many of the early tales recounted in the Chronicles and the folklore, the author has made a careful effort to avoid the often tried but always fruitless attempts to trace into the dim past many motifs which can be found not only in Ukrainian but also in other Indo-European languages; he treats the vague references of the early princely period with true scientific objectivity. Needless to say, he follows the conceptions of Professor Michael Hrushevsky and the majority of the Ukrainian scholars in considering the early literature as definitely Old Ukrainian, despite the efforts of the Great Russian scholars to claim that all the literature of Kiev was "Old Russian," and that the Ukrainian language only began somewhere in the twelfth century or even later—as is now held by the Soviet scholars. His treatment of the various genres of the early period and especially of the Tale of Ihor's Armament is specially good. So are his studies of the Chronicles and the other works of this period.

Undoubtedly the best part of the book is that which deals with the Renaissance and the Ukrainian baroque. This was a period of religious tension between the Ukrainian Orthodox and those groups which acknowledged Papal supremacy (the so-called Uniats); it was at this time that Polish influence was at its height, while the greater Ukrainian scholars were being called to Moscow. Much of the writing of the period seems artificial by our standards and tastes; but Professor Čiževsky brings out very well the literary devices and images of the writers. In fact he is perhaps the first author to lay adequate stress upon these literary matters, and to study the literature as literature rather than merely as religious propaganda for one side or the other.

His third great period, the revival of modern Ukrainian literature through classicism and romanticism, is far better known. Here he lays much stress upon the formal qualities of the language, the verse, and the prose. His treatment of such men as Kotlyarevsky, Kvitka, and Shashkevych contains much that is thought provoking and interesting. It is perhaps unfortunate that he does not give brief summaries of the lives and careers of the various authors; for their personalities and

social and political position did influence to a considerable extent their viewpoint and the influences exerted upon them from abroad.

His treatment of Taras Shevchenko is perhaps the most unsatisfactory section. Shevchenko, the greatest poet of Ukraine, was a very distinct personality, with an unusual fate. He rose in a few years from a serf to a member of fashionable society, only to be arrested and put in a Russian disciplinary battalion. The author's emphasis on the formal aspects of Shevchenko's poetry somewhat obscures the real greatness of the man and his work. It is perhaps also unfair to group him with Kiev romanticism, for he commenced to write in St. Petersburg and his greatest poems were written before he ever visited Kiev. Yet his closest friends were in the Kievan circle, and to that extent the classification is correct; but we would like to see a clearer exposition of the thought and ideals of the poet.

Another very valuable feature of the work is the summary of each individual period of Ukrainian literature and its relationship to similar movements elsewhere. These short sketches give a good picture of Ukrainian culture and the peculiarities of the Ukrainian development, and of Ukrainian life in each of its separate phases.

This is an admirable piece of work and it will be a standard work of reference for a long while. We can only congratulate the author and express the hope that he will continue his history down through the modern period, including the brilliant flowering of the DP's in Germany and the work that writers are doing in the emigration, as compared with the conventional clichés that are passing for literature under Soviet rule. Professor Čiževsky has filled a real need in Slavic scholarship, for which we must be grateful.

CLARENCE A. MANNING

Columbia University

VARIA

BOOKS RECEIVED

Adler, Alfred. Sens et composition du Jeu de la Feuillée. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956. v, 46 p.

Avré, Barna M. A la recherche du théâtre français. Hollywood: Nabor, 1956. 38 p.

Bart, Benjamin F. Flaubert's Landscape Descriptions. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956. ix, 70 p.

Bartra, Augustí. Le Livre de Marsias. Traduit du catalan par Louis Bayle. Paris: Pierre Seghers, 1956. 93 p.

Baudelaire, Charles. The Mirror of Art. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1956. xxiv, 370 p.

Bergel, Kurt. Georg Brandes und Arthur Schnitzler: Ein Briefwechsel. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1956. 240 p.

Bernbaum, Ernest, and others. The English Romantic Poets: A Review of Research. Revised edition. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1956. viii, 307 p.

Beyer, Harald. A History of Norwegian Literature. Translated and edited by Einar Haugen. New York: New York University Press for American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1956. x, 370 p.

Blackmur, R. P. Anni Mirabiles 1921-1925: Reason in the Madness of Letters. Washingon: Library of Congress, 1956. v, 55 p.

Catalán, Diego. Un cronista anónimo del siglo XIV (La Gran Crónica de Alfonso XI. Hallazgo, estilo, reconstrucción). La Laguna: Universidad de La Laguna, 1955. 257 p. (Biblioteca Filológica.)

Chapman's Homer. The Iliad, The Odyssey, and the Lesser Homerica. Edited, with introductions, textual notes, commentaries, and glossaries, by Allardyce Nicoll. New York: Pantheon Books, 1956. 2 vols. xxii, 740, xvi, 654 p. (Bollingen Series, XLI.)

Churchill, Charles. The Poetical Works. Edited with an introduction and notes by Douglas Grant. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. xxii, 587 p.

Cioranescu, Alejandro. El barroco o el descubrimiento del drama. La Laguna: Universidad de La Laguna, 1957. 445 p.

Coghill, Nevill. Geoffrey Chaucer. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1956. 67 p.

Correa, Gustavo. La poesía mítica de Federico García Lorca. Eugene, Ore.: University of Oregon Publications, 1957. vi, 174 p.

Echeverria, Durand. Mirage in the West: A History of the French Image of American Society to 1815. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957. xvii, 300 p.

Erämetsä, Erik. Englische Lehnprägungen in der deutschen Empfindsamkeit des 18. Jahrhunderts. Helsinki, 1955. 136 p. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae.)

Fiore, Silvestro. Über die Beziehungen zwischen der arabischen und der frühitalienischen Lyrik. Cologne, 1956. 196 p. (Kölner Romanistische Arbeiten, Neue Folge, Heft 8.)

García Gutiérrez, Antonio. El diablo nocturno. Edición, prólogo y notas de Harvey L. Johnson. Mexico City, 1956. 72 p. (Colección Studium, No. 13.)

Gicovate, Bernard. Julio Herrera y Reissig and the Symbolists. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957. viii, 106 p.

Ihara Saikaku. Five Women Who Loved Love. (Translated by W. Theodore de Bary.) Rutland, Vt., and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1956. 246 p.

LIBRARY
APR 11 1957
MANHATTAN
KANSAS

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Jacquot, Jean (editor). La Musique instrumentale de la Renaissance: Etudes réunies et présentées. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1955. 394 p.

Jones, George Fenwick (translator). Wittenwiler's Ring and the Anonymous Scots Poem Colkelbie Sow. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956. xiv, 246 p.

Kinneavy, James Leo, F.S.C. A Study of Three Contemporary Theories of Lyric Poetry. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1956. vii, 175 p.

Kridl, Manfred. A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture. Translated by Olga Scherer-Virski. New York: Columbia University Press; The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1956. xii, 525 p.

Lillard, Richard G. American Life in Autobiography. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1956. v, 140 p.

Linsalata, Carmine Rocco. Smollett's Hoax: Don Quixote in English. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1956. ix, 116 p.

Lord, George deF. Homeric Renaissance: The Odyssey of George Chapman. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956. 224 p.

Macdonald, Allan Houston. Richard Hovey: Man and Craftsman. Durham: Duke University Press, 1957. xiv, 265 p.

Massie, Lillian, and others (editors). The Major in English. Arkansas Experiment in Teacher Education, 1956. iii, 120 p.

Richmond, W. Kenneth. Education in the U.S.A.: A Comparative Study. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. 227 p.

Rotrou. Vencelas: Tragi-comédie. Edition critique (éditée par W. Leiner). Saarebrücken: West-Ost-Verlag, 1956. lx, 103 p.

Schoolfield, George C. The Figure of the Musician in German Literature. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956. xv, 204 p.

Society and Self in the Novel. English Institute Essays, 1955. Edited with a foreword by Mark Schorer. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956. xviii, 155 p.

Thomas, R. Hinton. Thomas Mann: The Mediation of Art. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. vi, 188 p.

Thompson, Stith. Motif-Index of Folk Literature. Revised and enlarged edition. Vol. III, F-H. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956. 519 p.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Professor H. Hatzfeld (Catholic University) and Professor Yves Le Hir (University of Grenoble) are preparing a French edition of the *Critical Bibliography of the New Stylistics*. This new edition will be entirely revised and brought up to date. The authors would be grateful for indications of omissions, errors, and additions. The bibliography is limited to the field of Romance literatures.

Victorian Studies is a new quarterly to appear at Indiana University under the editorship of Professors Appleman, Madden, and Wolff. It will publish articles on the humanities, arts, and sciences relevant to English culture of the period 1830-1914, book reviews, an annual Victorian bibliography, notes and queries.

The *Centennial Review of Arts and Science*, published by the College of Science and Arts of Michigan State University, begins with the Winter 1957 number. The editor is Branford P. Millar.

The *Italian Quarterly* will issue its first number shortly. Carlo L. Golino, University of California at Los Angeles, is the managing editor. All articles will appear in English.